



Copyright Statement

This copy of the thesis/dissertation has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that its copyright rests with its author and that information derived from it may not be published without attribution.

Copyright ownership of theses and dissertations is retained by the author, but the student must grant to TWU royalty-free permission to reproduce and publicly distribute copies of the thesis or dissertation. In circumstances where the research for the thesis or dissertation has been done in conjunction with other policies discussed in The Texas Woman's University Policy on Intellectual Property, those policies will apply with regard to the author.

No further reproduction or distribution of this copy is permitted by electronic transmission or any other means. The user should review the copyright notice on the following scanned image(s) contained in the original work from which this electronic copy was made.

Section 108: United States Copyright Law

The copyright law of the United States [Title 17, of the United States Code] governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that use may be liable for copyright infringement.

No further reproduction and distribution of this copy is permitted by transmission or any other means.

Texas Woman's University ©2013.

www.twu.edu



THE INVESTIGATION OF ON-SITE SPONSORSHIP ACTIVATIONS AND
CONSUMER-FOCUSED SPONSORSHIP OUTCOMES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

BY

CHI-WEN YANG, B.ED., M.ED

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 2011

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
DENTON, TEXAS

October 10, 2011

To the Dean of the Graduate School:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Chi-Wen Yang Entitled "The Investigation of On-Site Sponsorship Activations and Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes." I have examined this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Kinesiology.

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

Copyright © Chi-Wen Yang, 2011
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the support of family, friends, and professors, I could not have achieved my goal of completing this degree so smoothly. First, I would like to recognize the members of my committee, Dr. Kimberly Miloch, Dr. David Nichols, Dr. David Rylander, and Dr. Sally Ford, and thank them for their time, guidance, and assistance throughout the completion of this dissertation. I would especially like to acknowledge Dr. Miloch's enthusiasm, mentoring, and inspiration throughout my Ph.D journey. You were always supportive of all my ideas and aspirations in my research, and by being your teaching assistant for three years, I learned enthusiasm for teaching. You are a truly an exemplary role model for aspiring professors.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to those individuals of the Grand Prairie AirHogs who supported my study throughout the process and also to those participants who completed the survey. Special appreciation is extended to Mr. J. Willms for providing expertise and resources. Without your help and cooperation, I could not have completed the dissertation I wanted to write.

Furthermore, I would like to express my gratitude for my friends who have provided strength and stability throughout my doctoral career. Thanks especially to Meih-siu Chuo and Ming-chen Ko for your friendships and assistance with my dissertation; thanks to Kuo-wei Lee for your advice on completing every step of my Ph.D and your constant care for my future career; thanks to the Kuo-cheng Feng family for helping me

and my wife make it through the toughest moments in our lives and providing unlimited care. You guys are the best.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my parents and my entire family. To my parents, I know you are in heaven, and I will always make you proud of me. To Chi-liang Yang, my wonderful brother, I thank you for your spiritual and financial support. To my uncle and aunt, you have treated me like a real son and I thank you for the warmest care. Finally, I want to thank my superwoman wife, Chien-chi Hung, for cheering me up, enduring my temper, and dealing with every errand so I could squeeze extra time for studying and working. You deserve recognition as an indispensable contributor to this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

CHI-WEN YANG

THE INVESTIGATION OF ON-SITE SPONSORSHIP ACTIVATIONS AND CONSUMER-FOCUSED SPONSORSHIP OUTCOMES

DECEMBER 2011

The purpose of this study was to investigate the demographics and lifestyles of attendants in an Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) team and determine the effects of on-site activations on three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Also, this study compared the impact of various on-site activations in explaining the variance of the three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Data were collected at the three consecutive IPB games during the month of August 2011. A total of 194 participants 18 years or older completed a self-administrated questionnaire. Three regression analyses were used, in which brand preference, purchase intentions, and percentage of brand awareness were used as the dependent variables, respectively, and five on-site sponsorship activations (signage, PA announcement, advertising, in-game promotion, and product display/sampling/sales) as the independent variables.

The findings of this study revealed significant relationships between on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Product display/sampling/sales and signage had significant contributions to brand awareness, and so did signage to purchase intentions. In terms of the effectiveness of on-site activations, the findings

indicated that product display/sampling/sales has the most impact in explaining the variance in brand awareness and signage has the most impact in explaining the variance in purchase intentions; in addition, sponsors employing in-game promotion boasted high brand awareness rates despite no significant relationship between in-game promotion and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Also, this study provided recommendations, based on the results of the demographic and lifestyles of the IPB spectators, to maximize the benefits of both sponsor and sponsee.

The findings of this study suggested that sponsors should arrange multiple sponsorship activities in a sponsored event for obtaining better consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Sponsorship activations with high or low level of interaction with audiences generate positive impact on the sponsorship outcomes. In order to obtain greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, sponsors can consider the inclusion of sponsorship activation featuring a high level of interaction with audiences (e.g., product display/sampling/sales and in-game promotion) into sponsorship package. It provides the guideline of strategic implementation of sponsorship activation to increase return of investment on sponsorship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COPYRIGHT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Significance of the Study.....	8
Purpose of the Study.....	11
Research Questions.....	11
Definition of Terms	11
Limitations.....	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Sport Sponsorship.....	14
Sponsorship Activation	16
Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes	22
Sponsorship Awareness.....	22
Brand Preference	24
Purchase Intentions.....	25
Sponsorship Activation and Event Attendance	26
Sponsorship Activation and Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes.....	33
Summary.....	43
III. METHOD	45
Introduction	45
Participants and Setting	45
Participants	45
Setting.....	46
Data Collection	47
Sample Size	49
Instrumentation.....	49

Demographics and Lifestyles	49
Participation in On-Site Activations	50
Brand Awareness	51
Brand Preference	51
Purchase Intentions	52
Validity and Reliability	52
Data Analysis	53
 IV. RESULTS	 56
Introduction	56
Demographics and Lifestyles	57
Participation in On-Site Sponsorship Activations	60
Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes	66
Brand Awareness	66
Brand Preferences	70
Purchase Intentions	70
Reliability of Brand Preference and Purchase Intentions	70
Relationships between On-Site Activations and Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes	72
Summary	74
 V. DISCUSSION	 76
Introduction	76
Discussion and Implications	76
Limitations	84
Recommendations for Further Study	85
Conclusions	87
 REFERENCES	 91
 APPENDICES	
A. Questionnaire	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Demographics	58
2. Sample Lifestyles	61
3. Most Memorable On-Site Sponsorship Activation	63
4. Second Most Memorable On-Site Sponsorship Activation	63
5. Participation in On-Site Sponsorship Activation	64
6. Rate of On-Site Sponsorship Activation Participation	65
7. Sponsorship Awareness	67
8. Means, Standard Deviations, Factor Loadings (B), and Cronbach's alpha for Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes	71
9. Multiple Correlation of Sponsorship Activation with Brand Awareness	73
10. Multiple Correlation of Sponsorship Activation with Purchase Intentions	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the importance of sponsorship as a marketing and communication tool has grown considerably. International Event Group (IEG) has investigated both the percentage of sponsorship rights fees in overall marketing budgets by small, medium, and large corporations worldwide since 2000 and has estimated the dollars spent on sponsorship in North American companies since 1985. According to the IEG, the percentage of sponsorship rights fees in overall marketing budgets has consistently grown, and sponsorship rights fees accounted for 25.4% of companies' overall marketing budgets in 2010 ("Sponsors Send," 2010). The latest IEG report revealed that spending shrank 0.6% in 2009, which was the first negative figure appearing in IEG's 25-year annual year-end industry reviews ("Sponsorship Spending," 2010). Nevertheless, the slight decrease in 2009 does not mean that sponsorship has proven less important for North American companies. The sponsorship spending in 2009 remained \$16.51 billion, and IEG still positively forecasted a 3.4% increase in spending for 2010 ("Sponsorship Spending," 2010).

Cornwell and Maignan (1998) suggested that sponsorship embraces two central factors—an exchange process and leveraging activities. The exchange process denotes the exchange between the sponsorship rights owner (event property) and the sponsor, where the rights owner receives a rights fee while the sponsor obtains the right to

associate itself with the event sponsored. Second, the sponsor leverages the association by implementing marketing activities to communicate with the target market. In order to accomplish marketing objectives effectively, the sponsor must implement meaningful marketing activities in conjunction with the sponsorship to deliver messages to specific target markets. This process has been defined as sponsorship activation (Kutintara, 2009). It is important to note that the term activation is often confused with leveraging. Cornwell, Weeks, and Roy (2005) argue that leveraging and activation share similar meanings, and they define sponsorship activation or sponsorship leveraging as “collateral communication of a brand’s relationship with a property” (p. 36). In fact, the two terms, leveraging and activation, have been used interchangeably when describing sport sponsorship service activities in sport marketing academic literature (Cornwell et al., 2005; DeGaris, West, & Dodds, 2009; Weeks, Cornwell, & Drennan, 2008).

Numerous studies indicate that sponsorship can be rather ineffective if sponsors do not leverage the association (Arthur, Scott, Woods, & Booker, 1998; Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005; Cornwell & Maignan, 1998; Irwin, Sutton, & McCarthy, 2008; Kelly & Whiteman, 2010; Meenaghan, 1991, 1994, 1996; Sandler & Shani, 1993) or only utilize conventional sponsorship leveraging such as signage at a sporting event (Choi, Stotlar, & Park, 2006; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Séguin, 2007; Stotlar, 2005).

Farrelly and Quester (2005) discovered that leveraging is a controllable factor for a sponsee to improve sponsors’ satisfaction of their sponsorship relationship. They surveyed 86% (46/54) of first-tier sponsors from the Australian Football League (AFL)

and its clubs and examined the effects of trust and commitment on two relationship outcomes—economic satisfaction and noneconomic satisfaction. The results revealed a significant relationship between commitment and economic satisfaction, in which commitment was measured by leverage investment, and economic satisfaction was measured by the positive affective response to economic rewards that flow from the relationship. The results showed that sponsees' commitment to leveraging sponsorship contributes to the improvement of sponsors' economic satisfaction in relation to the sponsorship relationship.

Cornwell (1995) reviewed the sponsorship literature concerning the development of sponsorship and concluded, "sponsorship has moved from a philanthropic orientation to a market-driven orientation" (p. 14). The veracity of the notion that sponsorship has evolved into a marketing-driven or objective-driven process has also been supported by several scholars (Alexandris, Tsaousi, & James, 2007; Arthur et al., 1998; Howard & Crompton, 2004; Masterman, 2007). When engaging in sponsorship, corporate sponsors set a variety of marketing objectives they expect sponsorship to accomplish. Sponsorship, integrated into the marketing mix, can be used to impact several types of target markets including consumers, channel members, financial institutions, community leaders, or employees (Gardner & Shuman, 1988). When engaging in sport sponsorship, corporate sponsors are inclined to establish marketing objectives relative to increasing brand awareness, enhancing brand attitudes, or increasing sales (Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou, 2004; Copeland, Frisby, &

McCarville, 1996; Fortunato, 2009; Lamount & Dowell, 2008; Lough & Irwin, 2001; Ludwig & Karabetsos, 1999; Sparks & Westgate, 2002; Thwaites & Carruthers, 1998; Tomasini, Frye, & Stotlar, 2004).

Cornwell et al. (2005) proposed a theoretical model of consumer-focused sponsorship-linked marketing communication in which they compiled the factors that could impact consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. In the model, consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes were defined as the sponsorship outcomes that can be utilized to determine sponsorship effectiveness in communicating with target audiences. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes were comprised of consumers' cognitive outcomes (e.g., awareness and image), affective outcomes (e.g., liking and preference), and behavioral outcomes (e.g., purchase intentions and real purchase behavior). Among the factors that affect the consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, activation emerged as one of the most controllable factors for sponsors relative to the consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in the model.

Numerous field studies examining sponsorship effectiveness have found a positive relationship between activation and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Those studies note that the sponsors implementing extra marketing activities such as on-site product sampling/display/sales, advertising, and/or promotion on top of signage obtained higher brand awareness rates (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Jalleh, Donovan, Giles-Corti, & Holman, 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Papadimitriou & Apostolopoulou, 2009; Pitts, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996;

Stotlar, 1993), greater results of attitudinal measure (Jalleh et al., 2002), and lower dilution of sponsorship effectiveness from ambushing marketing (Sandler & Shani, 1993; Stotlar, 1993).

Two studies empirically tested the relationship between sponsorship investment and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The results of the two studies revealed that sponsorship investment is positively related to brand awareness (Johar, Pham, & Wakefield, 2006; Vale, Serra, Vale, & Vieira, 2009). In the marketplace, higher sponsorship investment in an event always stems from a higher-tier sponsorship package containing more leveraging activities. Therefore, it could be assumed that the extent of activation is associated with consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Other studies further examined whether increased leveraging activities contributed to greater sponsorship outcomes. The results of the two studies indicated that the scope of leveraging activities has a positive relationship with attitude toward sponsor, image transfer from event to brand, and purchase intentions toward sponsors' products (Dardis, 2009 ; Grohs, Wagner, & Vsetecka, 2004). Those studies support the assumption that increasing leveraging activities leads to greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Shannon and Turley (1997) surveyed fans at both men's and women's games in the NCAA Division I and examined whether on-site activations impact their purchase intentions and real purchase behavior. The results revealed that a majority of the surveyed fans were willing to purchase sponsors' products or had purchased sponsors'

products due to on-site activations. In addition, DeGaris et al. (2009) directly assessed the differences in consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes between those who attended on-site activations and those who did not. The results revealed that in terms of attitude toward sponsor and purchase intentions, on-site activations positively affected those who attended more than those who did not (DeGaris et al., 2009). The results of the two studies signal the positive impact of on-site activations on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Three studies further examined what type of on-site activation is better for improving consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Both McCarville, Floord, and Froats's (1998) and Sneath, Finney, and Close's (2005) studies showed that those who attended on-site activations that provided more interaction with attendees (e.g., product sample, giveaway, competition for winning sponsor's product) had greater positive response in perceptions of the sponsor's product, attitude toward the sponsor, and purchase intentions than those who experienced on-site activations featuring less interaction (e.g., signage, print-ads, public address (PA) announcements). Furthermore, Coppetti, Wentzel, Tomczak, and Henkel (2009) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between the level of audience participation in on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The results revealed that a greater level of audience participation resulted in more favorable brand attitudes and greater image transfer. The three studies support that the level of interaction provided with on-site

activations is a key factor in enhancing activation's effectiveness in positively impacting consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

In this study on-site activation was defined as marketing activities in conjunction with sponsorship, such as signage, on-site product/service sales, product sampling, and in-game promotions, that are performed around a sports facility to promote sponsors' brand/product to on-site spectators. Both Shannon and Turley's (1997) and DeGaris et al.'s (2009) studies showed that on-site activations had a positive impact on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. However, in both studies it was not specified what on-site activations were included. Therefore, no evidence showed what kind of on-site activation is better in improving sponsorship outcomes. Similarly, researchers in all three studies manipulated different groups of on-site activations and compared their effects in consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes between groups (Coppetti et al., 2009; McCarville et al., 1998; Sneath et al., 2005). The results revealed significant differences in consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes between those who attended on-site activations that provided a high level of interaction with attendees and those who did not attend. The results illustrate that on-site activations providing more interaction show better performance in consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The studies do not explain, however, whether on-site activations that provide less interaction—such as signage, print-ads, and PA announcements—have impacts on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Surprisingly, despite the fact that their effectiveness is unproven, on-site activations such as signage, print-ads, and PA

announcements nevertheless remain popular marketing activities frequently used to leverage sponsorship in professional sport events. However, in the sport marketing literature there is no empirical evidence confirming the positive impact of such on-site activations on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Despite the dramatic increase in leveraging spending in recent years, a paucity of empirical research exists examining the impact of sponsorship activation on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Dardis, 2009; DeGaris et al., 2009; Grohs et al., 2004; Shannon & Turley's, 1997). In order to document the effect of sponsorship activation, this study focused on examining the relationships between prevalent on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in a professional sporting event—an Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) game. An IPB game features various on-site activations. Therefore, it represents an ideal forum in which to examine on-site activations and their effects on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Significance of the Study

Scholarly study rarely explores the demographics and lifestyles of event attendees in Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) level. Moreover, an IPB franchise, unlike major league sport franchise, usually lacks adequate financial resource and possesses limited marketing crew to undertake a marketing research concerning such topic. Therefore, little is known about the demographics and lifestyles of the spectators in the IPB. The current study would explore the demographics and lifestyle of the spectators in the IPB games.

In light of the limited scholarship on the effect of sponsorship activations on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, the contribution of this study is to determine whether on-site activations have significant impacts on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in a professional sporting event. In addition, since no research to date provides empirical evidence concerning the impact of on-site activations that provide limited interaction with audiences such as signage, print-ads, and public announcements on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, the current study would document whether there are relationships between the use of such types of on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Past studies have found that on-site activations featuring a high level of interaction with audiences lead to more positive consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in a cause-related sports event and an art event (Coppetti et al., 2009; McCarville et al., 1998; Sneath et al., 2005). Such methods, however, have not been empirically tested in a commercial sports event. This study would empirically test them in a professional sports event, namely, an IPB game.

Moreover, academic researchers have reinforced the importance of strategic implementation of activation (Arthur et al., 1998; Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005; Choi et al., 2006; Cornwell & Maignan, 1998; Irwin et al., 2008; Meenaghan, 1991; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Stotlar, 2005), but little research examines what kind of on-site activation is better in improving consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Coppetti et al., 2009; McCarville et al., 1998; Sneath et al., 2005). This study

would empirically compare the importance of various prevalent on-site activations in explaining the variance of three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes—consumers' cognitive outcomes (sponsorship awareness), affective outcomes (brand preference), and behavioral outcomes (purchase intentions). Such issues are essential objects of study because these three consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes are the most common sponsorship objectives for corporate sponsors of sport events (Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou, 2004; Choi, 2010; Copeland et al., 1996; Fortunato, 2009; Jarvis, 2002; Lamount & Dowell, 2008; Lough & Irwin, 2001; Ludwig & Karabetsos, 1999; Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou, & Dounis, 2008; Smolianov & Aiyeku, 2009; Sparks & Westgate, 2002; Thwaites & Carruthers, 1998; Tomasini et al., 2004).

Knowing the demographics and lifestyles of event attendees in IPB level will aid sport marketers in determining market segments, sponsorship strategies, and branding strategies. In addition, the results of this study will enrich sponsorship activation literature and also benefit scholars, corporate sponsors, and sponsorship rights owners. The study will provide scholars with a stronger understanding of the effectiveness of activating sponsorship in a commercial sporting event. As such, sponsors can find effective activation methods to reach their objectives by referring to the results of this study. Similarly, sponsorship rights owners can package effective activations for sponsors based on their sponsorship objectives. The findings of this study may assist in generating a greater return on investment for both sponsees and sponsors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the demographics and lifestyles of attendees in an Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) team and determine the effects of on-site activations on three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. In this study, on-site activations consisted of signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements, while consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes included a cognitive outcome (sponsorship awareness), an affective outcome (brand preference), and a behavioral outcome (purchase intentions). This study also compared the impact of various on-site activations in explaining the variance of three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Research Questions

- Q1. What are the demographics and lifestyles of spectators?
- Q2. What are the relationships between on-site activations and spectators' (1) brand awareness, (2) brand preference, and (3) purchase intentions?
- Q3. Which on-site activation variable has the most impact in explaining variances among spectators' (1) brand awareness, (2) brand preference, and (3) purchase intentions?

Definition of Terms

- 1. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes: The sponsorship outcomes that can be utilized to determine sponsorship effectiveness in communicating with target

audiences. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes consist of consumers' cognitive outcomes (e.g., awareness and image), affective outcomes (e.g., liking and preference), and behavioral outcomes (e.g., purchase intentions and real purchase behavior) (Cornwell et al., 2005).

2. On-site activations: Marketing activities in conjunction with sponsorship that are performed around a sports facility to promote sponsors' brand/product to on-site spectators, including signage, on-site product/service sales, and in-game promotion.
3. Sponsorship activation: "Collateral communication of a brand's relationship with a property" (Cornwell et al., 2005, p. 36).

Limitations

1. Spectators at different events may experience different levels of sponsorship stimulus exposure and different frequencies of event participation. In order to control for the impact of the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure and the frequency of event participation in the effectiveness of on-site sponsorship activation, the data utilized for this study was collected at three IPB games that played in three consecutive days near the end of the 2011 regular season.
2. The results for this study may only represent this particular IPB franchise and can only be generalized to this franchise.
3. There are many factors that affect consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, including relationship articulation, goodwill, team attachment, incongruence,

and sport involvement. This study only considers the impact of sponsorship activation on sponsorship outcomes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of on-site activations on three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. It also compared the impact of various on-site activations in explaining the variance of three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. This chapter presents a review of previous studies related to those research areas. Two primary areas related to this study are *sponsorship activation* and *consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes*. The chapter especially addresses prevalent on-site activations in the Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) containing signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and public announcement messages, as well as examining the most common consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, including sponsorship awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions.

Sport Sponsorship

Prior to the 1984 Summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles, the major financing sources of the Olympic Games had primarily come from government funding, donations, and lotteries. The success of the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles transformed the funding structure of the future Olympic Games and started a new era for sport sponsorship. Its corporate sponsorship programs generated approximately \$215 million

(Irwin et al., 2008). As a result, sponsorships rights owners have been confident in the potential of sport sponsorship to make profits while sponsors have taken advantage of the ability of sport sponsorship to communicate with consumers and create business-to-business opportunities (Irwin et al., 2008; Masterman, 2007). Sport sponsorship has become a major revenue stream for the Olympic Games.

Sport properties, whether at the professional, amateur, or university level, are heavily dependent on the revenue from sport sponsorship (Danylchuk, 2000; Jowdy & McDonald, 2002; Kutintara, 2009; Stotlar, 2005; Tomasini et al., 2004). Similarly, corporations have increasingly attempted to integrate sport sponsorship into their marketing mixes (Ali, Cornwell, Hguyen, & Coote, 2006; Crompton, 2004; Javalgi, Traylor, Gross, & Lampman, 1994). IEG reports that sponsorship spending from corporations in North America has grown continuously since 2000 ("Sponsorship Spending," 2010). Among the colossal sponsorship spending in 2009, sport sponsorship (\$11.3 billion) constituted the largest proportion, followed by entertainment tours and attractions sponsorship (\$1.64 billion), cause sponsorship (\$1.51 billion), art sponsorship (\$820 million), festivals, fairs and annual events sponsorship (\$756 million), and associations and membership organizations sponsorship (\$496 million) ("Sponsorship Spending," 2010).

Moreover, IEG has extended its investigation into the four largest major league sports in the United States—the National Football League (NFL), the Major League Baseball (MLB), the National Basketball Association (NBA), and the National Hockey

League (NHL). The overall sponsorship revenue of the four professional sport leagues in 2009 was \$2.12 billion. The NFL (\$813 million) generated the highest sponsorship revenue, followed by MLB (\$514 million), the NBA (\$494 million), and the NHL (\$299 million) ("Pro Sports," 2010). In addition, the overall sponsorship revenue of the four major leagues in 2010 was projected at a 7.6% increase to \$2.28 billion ("A-B Lawsuit," 2010).

Sponsorship Activation

The essential feature of activation in sport sponsorship is the "collateral communication of a brand's relationship with a property" (Cornwell et al., 2005, p. 36). In other words, "in sponsorship the money spent over and above the rights fee paid to the sponsored property is called activation/leveraging spending" (IEG, 2010, ¶ 1). IEG has investigated the average ratio of activation spending to rights fees by sponsorship decision makers at small, medium, and large corporations worldwide. According to IEG (2010), activation spending has continuously exceeded rights fees since 2003, and the average ratio of activation spending to sponsorship rights fees in 2010 was 1.4:1.

Often, activational activities are packaged with sponsorship rights for sales. Two widespread methods to sell activational activities are traditional sponsorship packages and flexible (tailored) sponsorship packages. The sport property that adopts the traditional strategy groups activational activities into different entitlement packages and then offers them to prospective sponsors. The higher level of sponsorship contains more activational activities and costs more than the lower level of sponsorship. Mostly the

sport property offers the higher level sponsors product exclusivity to associate with an event within a product category (Howard & Crompton, 2004). For example, if MasterCard is the exclusive credit card company sponsoring the event, there will be no other credit card company allowed to sponsor or associate with the event. The FC Porto, a Portuguese football club, is a sport property adopting this strategy to sell activational activities (Vale et al., 2009). Sponsorship packages were titled as Gold sponsors, Platinum sponsors, and Main sponsors. Gold sponsors received the following rights: (1) use of the team's name and logo, (2) presence in the team's publications, (3) signage around the stadium, and (4) co-sponsorship of one match. Platinum sponsors had the same rights as gold sponsors plus the following: (1) signage near the ground, (2) three-minute rotating advertisement panels, and (3) official sponsorship of one-match. Main sponsors had the aforementioned rights and also are shirt sponsors. The content of the three sponsorship agreements is not negotiable. The sponsors purchasing a certain sponsorship package have two options—either use or give up the rights to use those included activational activities. Contrary to the strategy of using traditional sponsorship packages, flexible sponsorship packages offer an opportunity for potential sponsors to negotiate benefits. The sport properties using this strategy usually create an inventory of possible sponsorship assets in advance and then present the inventory to potential sponsors for sales. The Dallas Mavericks utilize this method to solicit its sponsorships, presenting all individual activational activities such as signage, electric board advertisements, hospitality suites, and in-game promotions in sponsorship proposals

(Dallas Mavericks Sponsorship Overview, 2010-2011, 2010). Sponsors select the benefits that best meet their demands and negotiate the price.

In both traditional and flexible sponsorship packages, on-site activations are often included as activational activities. For example, FedEx employed a diversity of on-site activations in its sponsorship of the FedExCup in 2007. The on-site activation utilized by FedEx included locating banners with large player imaging at entry points to the golf courses, delivering event-related advertising and giveaways, conducting sweepstakes and promotions, and providing hospitality tents as well as ProLink GPS-enabled golf carts (Smith, 2008).

On-site signage is one of the sponsorship benefits requested frequently by corporate sponsors. According to IEG (2010), “on-site signage” has been ranked within the top three most valuable sponsorship benefits in the past 5 years. Similarly, in Tomasini et al.’s (2004) study, “on-site signage/advertising” was the most commonly requested benefit in Division I-AA (Division I Football Championship Subdivision, FCS) universities and the second most commonly requested in Division I-A (Division I Football Bowl Subdivision, FBS) and Division I-AAA (Division I-Non-Football) universities. In the marketing literature, several studies have explored the factors that shape the effectiveness of on-site signage (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pope & Voges, 1997; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989). Numbers of signs and location of signage had the greatest impact on its effectiveness. The results of those studies suggest that the optimal number for signage is three to four

signs (Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Pope & Voges, 1997), and the premium locations for signage are areas that are “part of the game,” highly visible areas, or regions of dense traffic. “Part of the game” locations could include the shot clock area and basketball floor, while highly visible or dense traffic areas could be near event concessions, entrances, and exits (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pope & Voges, 1997; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989).

In one field study, Maxwell and Lough (2009) collected data from two National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I women’s basketball games in which one game was located in a signage arena and the other was held in a non-signage arena. The study examined the difference in awareness rates of sponsors in the two arenas. The results revealed that the average percentage of spectators that correctly identified at least one sponsor in a signage arena (37.03%) was close to that in a non-signage arena (35.34%), suggesting that the presence of on-site signage has only a slight impact on sponsorship awareness. However, in the study the researchers did not specify numbers and location of signage. Limited numbers and poor location of signage could be the reason for diminished effectiveness of on-site signage on sponsorship awareness (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pope & Voges, 1997; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989).

In-game promotions are also utilized regularly in the activation of sport sponsorship. Such promotions usually work via contest, lottery, or performance, and the winners of the contest or lottery are rewarded with sponsorship-related giveaways such as

clothes or caps and sponsorship-related monetary incentives such as coupons, cash refunds, or saving cards (Lagae, 2005). For example, the Carolina Hurricanes provided several sponsorship-related contests during a 2011 game promoting their corporate sponsors. Fans could be selected by waving a promotional veterans identity card issued by the supermarket chain Harris Teeter to win a Harris Teeter gift certificate, by making a noise to support the team to win a \$100 check from RBC Bank, or by answering quiz challenge questions about the team during the game to win prizes from Ticketmaster ("In-game Promotion," 2011). In-game promotions via lottery or performance can also be seen in Dallas Mavericks games. In the case of lottery, the Mavericks choose a row of seats and give away free tickets for attendees sitting in that row. With regard to performance, the Mavericks present a band or a group of community cheerleaders during the game, attributing sponsorship of the performance to selected Mavericks sponsors.

Advertising is the most traditional way to use sport sponsorship to reach event spectators. A corporate sponsor cannot waste any exploitable place where brand names, logos, or information can be located. The sponsor should actively negotiate with a sport property for the space for sponsorship information. In addition to game-related materials such as event programs, posters, and flyers, Lagae (2005) also suggests several places to put sponsorship information: (1) competition, training, and leisure clothing of team athletes and their trainers, and (2) advertising articles such as diaries, blotting pads, calendars, ties, pins, sport bags, key chains, and T-shirts.

Choi et al. (2006) examined whether on-site sponsorship activations such as logo placement, product demonstrations, and hospitality tents match the interests of event spectators. The authors asked 17 spectators who attended the LG Action Sports Championships in 2004 to take photographs of the most interesting subjects or scenes at the event with an LG camera phone and then interviewed the surveyed participants. They found that not all of the on-site sponsorship activations caught spectator's attentions. They suggest that to reach the goal of providing meaningful experiences to consumers, sponsors must actively place the product in the hands of customers as an element of on-site sponsorship activation.

Common approaches to getting the product in the hands of the customers include on-site product sampling, display, and sales. Lagae (2005) states that sporting environments are extremely suitable for the implementation of sampling activities because they are exciting and relaxing and feature a diversity of target markets. On-site sponsorship-related sampling can be applied not only to fast-moving consumer goods or food products but also consumer durable products such as a car test drive (Lagae, 2005; Watt, 2008). "Sponsorship must motivate consumers to interact with the sponsor's products whether that's touching it, using it, speaking to a specialist about it, etc., and have them walk away with more knowledge about it" ("Product Integration: Not Just for Technology Companies Anymore," 2004, p. 3).

PA announcements are also widely utilized in sport events, and they can be presented solely or in concert with in-game promotions. In a field study, Veltri,

Luehmann-Jaynes, and Kuzma (2001) examined the impact of various PA announcement methods on consumer attitudes. The results revealed that less intrusive methods such as name mention generated more favorable attitudes than more intrusive methods such as “brought to you by.” Their research especially shows that for reaching higher consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, PA announcements should be constructed in less intrusive ways.

Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes

Cornwell et al. (2005) proposed a theoretical model of *consumer-focused sponsorship-linked marketing communication*. In the model, consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes are defined as the sponsorship outcomes that can be utilized to determine sponsorship effectiveness in communicating with target audiences. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes are composed of three major outcomes—cognitive outcomes (e.g., awareness and image), affective outcomes (e.g., liking and preference), and behavioral outcomes (e.g., purchase intentions and real purchase behavior). The present study focuses on sponsorship awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions.

Sponsorship Awareness

Sandage’s (1983) intermediate measures have been widely adopted to assess consumer awareness of sport sponsorship. Intermediate measures entail two distinct testing methods—recall and recognition. Measuring the ability of consumers to recall and/or recognize event sponsors is a method for assessing sponsorship awareness that is

well-established and accepted in scholarship (Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006). In sport sponsorship literature, there has been a multitude of studies utilizing recall and/or recognition to assess consumer awareness of sport sponsorship at a variety of sport events, including the Olympic Games, the Soccer World Cup, the Cricket World Cup, the LPGA, NASCAR, professional tennis, professional football, professional soccer, professional rugby, NCAA Division I sports, action sports, the Ski World Championships, the Gay Games, and grassroots sport (Barros, Barros, Santos, & Chadwick, 2007; Bennett, Henson, & Zhang, 2002; Boshoff & Gerber, 2008; Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Grohs et al., 2004; Harshaw & Turner, 1999; Ishikawa, Stotlar, & Walker, 1996; Kutintara, 2009; Lee & Bang, 2005; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Meir, Arthur, & Massingham, 1997; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Nicholls & Roslow, 1999; Pitts, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993, 2002; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989; Tripodi & Hirons, 2009; Turley & Shannon, 2000; Van Heerden, Kotze, & Bruwer, 2004).

According to Tripodi, Hirons, Bednall, and Sutherland (2003), brand recall tests the ability of consumers to remember the brand name when given its event sponsorship as a prompt: ("When you think of {Event Z}, which sponsors come to mind?"); brand sponsorship ("When you think of {Brand X}, what sponsorships come to mind?"); or category sponsorship ("When you think of {Category Y}, what sponsorships come to mind?"). Brand recognition measures the ability of consumers to demonstrate brand exposure when given the brand name as a prompt: ("I am going to tell you some of Brand

X's current or recent sponsorships. For each one, could tell me whether you were aware of, before today, of Brand X sponsoring that event"). In other words, in sponsor recall measures, subjects are asked to list as many sponsors as they can in response to an event sponsorship prompt, brand sponsorship prompt, or category sponsorship prompt. In the case of sponsor recognition measures, the subjects are asked to identify the sponsors of events from a list of potential sponsors that may include some dummy sponsors.

Brand Preference

Brand preference is one prevalent method to measure a consumer's affective response (Cornwell et al., 2005). The scholarly literature on the measurement of brand preference in sport sponsorship is also well established. Nicholls and Roslow (1999), Jalleh et al. (2002), and Davies, Veloutsou, and Costa (2006) have provided sport marketing and management with practices to measure consumers' brand preference. In their studies, surveyed participants were provided a list of leading brands in the same product category and asked, "Which one do you prefer most?"

The mere exposure effect is useful in explaining how brand preference is formed when consumers are exposed to on-site sponsorship activations. Zajonc's (1968, 1980) studies of mere exposure effect have demonstrated that affective response such as liking or preference occurs when an individual is given mere repeated exposure to a stimulus. A meta-analysis of the mere exposure effect further found that it occurs when a stimulus is present in a variety of forms that include words, pictures, and figures (Bornstein, 1989). Olson and Thjømøe (2003) brought the examination of mere exposure into sponsorship-

like conditions and analyzed the mere exposure effect in light of two factors which they defined as the *central route to persuasion* and the *peripheral route to persuasion* in a low-involvement setting. The central route to persuasion depends on high-level cognitive processing of relevant product information that generates brand attitude change, while the peripheral route to persuasion requires low level processing (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). Their study reconfirmed the existence of the mere exposure effect; furthermore, the results revealed that in the case of a fictitious brand, individuals who were exposed to brand name plus brand information and who also processed additional brand information had greater brand preference than the following two groups: 1) those who were exposed to brand name plus information but did not process it, and 2) those who were only exposed to brand name. Such findings suggest that mere exposure to sponsorship stimulus such as brand name, brand logo, and brand information can lead to favorable brand preference, not to mention sponsorship stimulus that provides more interactive and pleasant experiences for the consumer such as product sampling and in-game promotions.

Purchase Intentions

Although purchase intentions do not guarantee the occurrence of actual purchase behavior, intentions play a critical role in guiding the behavior (Ajzen, 2001; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Howard and Crompton (2004) indicate that “intent-to-purchase studies are the most useful indicators of the impact of sponsorship on future sales” (p. 566). Indeed, sport sponsorship research is replete with examples of utilizing purchase

intentions to assess consumers' behavioral outcomes (Bennett, Cunningham, & Dees, 2006; Dees, Bennett, & Villegas, 2008, Ishikawa et al., 1996; Kutintara, 2009; Lachowetz & Irwin, 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pitt, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shannon & Turley, 1997; Stotlar, 1993, 2002; Turley & Shannon, 2000). Those studies adopted five-point Likert scales to measure consumers' purchase intentions.

Sponsorship Activation and Event Attendance

For sponsors, event attendance is a critical characteristic of a sports property when making a decision to sponsor a sport event. Corporate sponsors with consumer-focused sponsorship objectives are especially eager to gain the maximum exposure for their brands or products in return for sponsorship investment. To date, there is no study examining the relationship between sponsorship activation and event attendance, but there have been a multitude of empirical studies considering the relationship between promotion and attendance in professional sports events (Barilla, Gruben, & Levernier, 2008; Boyd & Krehbiel, 1999; Boyd, Krehbiel, & Farmer, 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Hixson, 2005; Lanzillo, 2010; McDonald & Rascher, 2000; Pruegger, 2003; Schoenrock & Johnson, 2009; Zhang, Lam, & Connaughton, 2003). For corporate sponsors, the promotions examined in the above studies are potential opportunities for the activation of sport sponsorship. As long as sponsors tie those promotions to sponsorship, the promotions are converted into activational activities that help sponsors to communicate with their target audiences, an effect illuminated by the aforementioned studies.

In one field study, Boyd and Krehibiel (1999) examined whether promotions can impact attendance and whether they can be effective in increasing attendance for games scheduled at different times, e.g., weekends versus weekdays, day games versus night games, or games against rivals versus non-rivals. They collected the data from six MLB teams over a 4-year period from 1994 to 1997. The results of running the combined six teams as a set of dates in the same year revealed that promotions were significantly predictive of attendance increases in four different years but not every individual team had a significant increase. Similarly, the researchers also found that the relationship between effectiveness of promotions and the timing differed from team to team and from year to year. However, general promotions run on weekdays and during day games were likely to lead to greater attendance increases.

In contrast to Boyd and Krehibiel's (1999) study, McDonald and Rascher (2000) used data including more MLB teams (19) in a shorter period (1 year). Not only did McDonald and Rascher (2000) examine the effect of promotions on attendance, but they also assessed the marginal impact on attendance of additional promotional days. The results revealed that running promotions generated an average increase in attendance of 14%. Although a negative effect on the marginal impact occurred by increasing the number of promotion days, the gain from running an extra promotion day outweighed the loss from this watering-down effect.

Similar to Boyd and Krehibiel's (1999) study, Boyd et al. (2003) also examined the impact of promotions on attendance and the effectiveness of promotions when

combined with schedule factors. The difference between the two studies is that promotions were grouped into three categories (price discount, giveaway, and special feature) in Boyd et al.'s (2003) study. The researchers gathered data from six MLB teams in the 1996 season. The results of the combined data for the six teams revealed that the combination of promotions had a significant positive effect on attendance, and the promotions raised attendance by an average of 19.6%. Furthermore, specifically examining three different types of promotions showed that only giveaways and special features significantly increased attendance, but a significant increase did not occur for each individual team. Also, the researchers found diminishing marginal returns while a promotion was combined with schedule factors that increase game attractiveness such as weekend games or rival games. They concluded that promotions would not significantly increase attendance when run at already-attractive games such as those scheduled on weekends or against rivals.

Instead of directly measuring the relationship between promotion and attendance, Zhang et al. (2003) examined the relationship between general market demands and professional sport consumption. They grouped general marketing demand variables that affected spectator game consumption into three categories—game attractiveness, economic consideration, and marketing promotion, and then successfully validated the three factors by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis. Ten professional sport consumption variables were included in the study, five of them related to event attendance (NBA games, WNBA games, MLB games, arena football games, and MiLH

games) and the other five related to TV viewing (NBA games, MLB games, NFL games, NHL games, MiLH games). Marketing promotion (publicity, advertising, and special promotional programs/giveaways) proved to be one of the three market demand factors significantly positively predictive of professional sport consumption.

Pruegger (2003) also conducted a study with regard to promotion and attendance. The data was collected from 14 of 29 teams in the East Coast Hockey League (ECHL) that were willing to participate in the study. In the study, promotion was found to be a significant predictor of attendance. Overall promotions led to an average increase in attendance of 21.16% when compared to non-promotional games. The effectiveness of promotions varied greatly among the 14 teams, but only one team had a slight decrease (-5.56%) in average attendance of promotional games when compared to average attendance of non-promotional games. In addition, the researcher broke down promotions adopted by the surveyed teams into eight types (concerts, magnetic schedule, puck night, fan appreciation, scout night, shootout, kids' day, and canned food drive) to examine their effectiveness. The results, concurrent with Boyd et al.'s (2003) study, revealed that different promotions had varying rates of effectiveness. Only three game day promotions—puck night, scouts night, and fan appreciation night—were found to increase attendance significantly over average.

In Hixson's (2005) study, promotions were also grouped into two different categories—price promotion and non-price promotion. Hixson (2005) examined both the impact of promotion on attendance and the relationship between the number of promotion

days and attendance. The data were collected from 31 randomly selected MiLB teams in the 2002 season. The results indicated that attendance with promotion was significantly higher than without promotion and that promotion raised attendance by an average of 40%. Also, a watering-down effect was found only for games with price promotions.

The method of grouping promotions in Browning and DeBolt's (2007) study is similar to Hixson's (2005). In Browning and DeBolt's (2007) study, promotions were divided into three categories—price promotion, non-price promotion, and a combination. The data were collected from four professional baseball organizations, one MLB club and three MiLB clubs, based in the same area. The results indicated that only two of the four teams (one MLB club and one MiLB club) had significant attendance increases when a promotion was used. In addition, conforming to Boyd et al.'s (2003) and Pruegger's (2003) studies, the results for the two teams revealed that the type of promotion impacted its effectiveness. Attendance significantly increased when non-price promotion was used in contrast to weaker increases with price promotion.

Similar to Boyd and Krehibel's (1999), McDonald and Rascher's (2000), and Boyd et al.'s (2003) studies, Barilla et al. (2008) also used data from the MLB. The data collected from 2,431 regular-season games played during the 2005 MLB season was used to determine which factor affects attendance. Promotion was found to have a positive impact on attendance. Overall, promotion drew 1,532 more fans per game on average. The study's insights on the differing impacts of various types of promotion coincided with previous studies (Boyd et al., 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Pruegger, 2003).

Bobblehead promotion was the most successful type in increasing attendance. It attracted 5,222 more fans than games that did not have promotions, followed by textile product giveaways (2,600 additional fans) and memorabilia giveaways (2,470 additional fans). In addition, promotion scheduling was found to affect promotion effectiveness. Promotions run during weekdays generated much larger attendance increases than promotions run during weekends.

In contrast to the previous studies (Barilla et al., 2008; Boyd et al., 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Hixson, 2005; Pruegger, 2003), Schoenrock and Johnson (2009) grouped promotions differently, into four categories—bobblehead promotions, giveaway promotions, coupon promotions, and event promotions. They used data from one MLB team in the 2008 season to examine the effects of the four different promotions on attendance. The results showed that different types of promotion had varying degrees of influence on attendance. Bobblehead and giveaway promotions were significantly predictive of attendance. Although registering no statistical significance, the other two promotions still had positive impacts on attendance.

Lanzillo (2010) also conducted a study considering type of promotion and attendance. Data was collected from fans that attended 5 of 20 games played by East Coast minor league teams that agreed to participate in the study. The five teams covered three levels in minor league baseball—1 AAA, 2 Class A Advanced, and 2 Independent. The researcher examined the impact of 15 types of promotions on fan decision to attend a game in which a five-point Likert scale measured fan decisions to attend games. Among

the 15 types of promotions evaluated in a five-point Likert scale, hat/cap giveaways ($M=4.2$) were found to be the most influential promotion type in affecting fan decisions to attend games, followed by free T-shirts ($M=4.1$). While concerts/in-game entertainment obtained a mean score of 3.7 on a decision-making importance scale, in-game contests received a mean score of 3.2. In addition, the number of games attended was found to affect the effectiveness of certain types of promotions. The results indicated that fans attending more games per season rated promotions more important in the decision to attend games when the promotions featured team and player affiliation, e.g., hat/cap giveaway, obtaining autographs, free T-shirt, or magnetic schedule giveaway.

As noted, promotion can be converted into sponsorship activation if sponsors tie those promotions to sponsorship. The results of the above studies have solidly confirmed the positive impact of promotion on attendance in different types and levels of professional sports events (Barilla et al., 2008; Boyd & Krehbiel, 1999; Boyd et al., 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Hixson, 2005; Lanzillo, 2010; McDonald & Rascher, 2000; Pruegger, 2003; Schoenrock & Johnson, 2009; Zhang et al., 2003). Although no study to date exists examining the relationship between sponsorship activation and attendance, based on the findings of the aforementioned studies it may be posited that sponsorship activation may positively impact event attendance.

Moreover, numerous studies concerning types of promotion and attendance discovered that non-price promotions such as giveaways and special events led to greater attendance increase than did price promotions (Barilla et al., 2008; Boyd et al., 2003;

Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Lanzillo, 2010; Pruegger, 2003; Schoenrock & Johnson, 2009). In addition to greater effectiveness in increasing attendance, non-price promotions were not found to generate watering-down effects, whereas price promotions did (Hixson, 2005). Such findings suggest that non-price promotion can be linked to sponsorship for the activation of sport sponsorship. Its higher effectiveness and lack of watering-down effect means it can generate the maximum exposure for sponsors' brands/products.

Sponsorship Activation and Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes

A multitude of field studies examining sponsorship effectiveness have identified the relationships between sponsorship activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Such studies note that sponsors employing certain extra marketing activities on top of signage obtained greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Jalleh et al., 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pitts, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993). In one field study, Sandler and Shani (1993) assessed brand awareness for both 1992 Summer Olympic Games sponsors and its ambushers. A mail questionnaire was used to collect data from a sports club in a large Eastern city. The results indicated that those sponsors who leveraged sponsorship with heavy advertisement or other promotion were more correctly identified than ambushers in the same category, such as credit card or phone service. Those without leveraging sponsorship encountered ambushing marketing in which the ambushers obtained higher correct identification than official sponsors in the same category. In

another field study, Stotlar (1993) also considered sponsorship effectiveness in the 1992 Winter Olympic Games. Stotlar (1993) examined brand awareness for both 1992 Winter Olympic Games TOP sponsors and U.S. Olympic Team sponsors, in which brand awareness was measured by both recall and recognition measures. The data was collected at 28 different places of public assembly using a mall intercept approach. Surprisingly, the results revealed that some ambushers received higher recall or recognition rates. The researcher ascribed the higher awareness rate of the ambushers to leveraging sponsorship with significant levels of advertising. Cuneen and Hannan (1993) also conducted a study to assess brand awareness for the sponsors at an LPGA tournament by surveying the event spectators. Brand awareness was gauged by recognition measure. They found that the signage of the sponsors having products/services available in the event was the most frequently recognized. Another brand awareness study conducted by Shilbury and Berriman (1996) also found that surveyed spectators of the St. Kilda Football Club in the Australian Football League recognized more frequently the sponsors with products available at the event. The two studies found that sponsors having products available at the event on top of signage received higher brand awareness rates (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996). Pitts (1998) extended sponsorship awareness studies to the Gay Games. The researcher adopted recall measure to examine the awareness rates of the Gay Games IV sponsors by surveying the event participants. The results revealed that the top three recalled sponsors were those who supported or leveraged their sponsorship with additional advertising (signage or print advertising), product giveaways,

and/or products available on site. Jalleh et al. (2002) also enlarged the literature of sponsorship effectiveness by examining changes in brand awareness and brand attitudes in relation to sponsors in two kinds of sport events. They adopted a before-and-after design survey to gather data from spectators in both Australian rules football and motor racing in Australia. The results indicated that sponsors achieving significant changes in awareness and attitudinal measures adopted the same marketing strategy—committing extra marketing efforts (giveaways or product displays) on top of signage to activate sponsorship. Similarly, Miloch and Lambrecht (2006) conducted a study to examine awareness rates of the sponsors at “State Games,” grassroots sports events, by surveying event spectators. Both recall and recognition measures were used to examine brand awareness rates. The results revealed that the sponsors that provided either giveaways or product sampling were included among the most frequently recalled and recognized, and the recognition rates of those sponsors were double those of the sponsors who did not activate their sponsorships.

The findings of the above field studies suggest that sponsors employing extra marketing activities such as on-site product/service sales, advertising, and promotion on top of signage obtained higher brand awareness rates (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Jalleh et al., 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pitts, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993), better results of attitudinal measure (Jalleh et al., 2002), and lower dilution of sponsorship effectiveness from ambushing marketing (Sandler & Shani, 1993; Stotlar, 1993). In spite of the lack of empirical evidence to demonstrate the

relationships between sponsorship activation and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in the above field studies, their findings do suggest the existence of positive relationships. In the marketing literature, however, several empirical studies concur with such suggestions, demonstrating positive relationships between investments in diverse types of sponsorship activation and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Coppetti et al., 2009; Dardis, 2009; DeGaris et al., 2009; Grohs et al., 2004; Johar et al., 2006; McCarville et al., 1998; Quester & Thompson, 2001; Shannon & Turley, 1997; Sneath et al., 2005; Vale et al., 2009). Such studies enumerate the specific ways sponsors can strengthen those relationships.

In a field study, Quester and Thompson (2001) examined changes in awareness and attitudes for three sponsors at art events. They adopted a before-and-after design mail survey to collect data from the audiences of the 1998 Adelaide Festival of the Arts in Australia. The corporate sponsors differed in the amount of spending on activations (advertising, public relationships activities, and sales promotions). The results revealed that the sponsors with the highest leveraging spending achieved significant changes in awareness rates and attitudes. The findings support the positive relationship between activation spending and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Johar et al. (2006) conducted a study to examine the relationship between sponsorship expenditures and brand awareness. The data was collected from the sponsors and fans of a MiLB team. The results indicated that the level of sponsorship expenditures was significantly positively related to the level of correct brand identification. Since

sponsorship expenditures in this study were not justified, the relationship between activation spending and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes could not be supported. However, in the marketplace, higher sponsorship investment in an event always comes with higher levels of sponsorship packages containing more leveraging activities. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume the existence of a positive relationship between sponsorship activation and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Similar to Johar et al. (2006), Vale et al. (2009) also considered sponsorship investment and brand awareness in their study of spectators of the Portuguese football club FC Porto, whose sponsorship investment was categorized into main sponsors, platinum sponsors, and gold sponsors. The activational activities included therein were additive: the higher-tier sponsors attained opportunities for more activational activities. Vale et al. (2009) show that the higher investment sponsors made, the greater brand awareness they achieved. Such results support the positive relationship between the extent of activational activities and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Two additional studies examined the relationship between the extent of activational activities and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Both studies found a positive relationship between the extent of activation and image transfer. The results revealed that the higher the extent of activation the sponsors implemented, the greater image transferred from event to brand. Grohs et al. (2004) demonstrated such effects surrounding activation in the sponsorship of the 2001 Alpine Ski World Championships Austria. Dardis (2009) conducted a study to examine the effect of repeated exposure to

sponsorship messages in evaluations of incongruent sponsors in a 1-day event. The congruence of sponsorship in this study was measured based on the degree of consumers' perception of congruence between a sponsor and a sponsee without considering any specific reasons. The researcher designed an experiment in which surveyed undergraduate students were exposed to print advertising of fictional companies sponsoring a cause-related event. The students were equally divided into groups exposed to either one or four sponsorship ads and asked questions concerning their attitudes toward sponsors, sponsor credibility, sponsor altruism, community relations, and purchase intention. The results revealed that the measures in attitude toward sponsor, community relations, and purchase intention were significantly higher at four exposures than at one exposure. That means that repeated exposure to sponsorship messages significantly enhanced attitude toward sponsor, perceptions of community relations, and purchase intention. Overall, the empirical evidence furnished by these two studies support the positive relationship between the extent of activation and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The results of the above studies demonstrate that the greater the expenditures in sponsorship investment, activation spending, and activational activities, the greater the consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes generated.

In contrast to such implications, however, Shannon and Turley (1997) conducted a study to directly examine the impact of activation on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The study gathered data from fans attending the last two home games of the regular season for both the men's and women's teams at an NCAA Division I university.

They examined both the impact of sponsorship-related, in-arena promotion in fans' purchase intentions and real purchase behavior as well as the differences in purchase intentions and real purchase behavior related to several variables. In the study, sponsorship-related, in-arena promotion was defined as "the use of any signs, scoreboard messages, giveaways, announcements, trade characters, or any other delivery technique that is designed to promote a company, brand, or organization to spectators who attend an event in a sports facility" (Shannon & Turley, 1997, p. 54). The results discovered the positive impact of sponsorship-related, in-arena promotion in both purchase intentions and real purchase behavior. Over 70% of the surveyed fans responded that "they would buy a product or patronize a company because it was advertised at this school's basketball games," and a majority (55.8%) of the surveyed reported that "they had actually patronized a business or bought a product because of this promotional support." In addition, the study found several factors generating significant differences both in purchase intentions and purchase behavior—type of game, attendance preference, and attendance frequency. Specifically, sponsorship-related, in-arena promotions have more impact on fans that attend men's games, more men's games than women's games, and greater numbers of games.

Similarly to Shannon and Turley's (1997) study, DeGaris et al. (2009) also directly examined the impact of activation on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. They examined the relationship between sponsorship-related sales promotions and the evaluations of NASCAR sponsors in relation to brand attitude and purchase intentions. In

the study, the researchers introduced the idea that sponsorship-related sales promotions are promotional activities similar to contests and sweepstakes, giveaways, loyalty programs, and product sampling. The data were collected by telephone interviews from 1,000 NASCAR fans. Fans were grouped into casual fan, moderate fan, avid fan, and super fan in which the method of grouping fans was not given. The results indicated that the super fans that participated in NASCAR sponsors' promotions had both significantly favorable attitudes and real purchase behavior for sponsors' products, compared to fans that did not participate. Such analysis shows that sponsorship-related sales promotions can enhance brand attitude and purchase behavior for high-loyalty fans. Both Shannon and Turley's (1997) and DeGaris et al.'s (2009) studies provide direct evidence for the significance of the impact of activation on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes

Moreover, three other studies have directly investigated this type of activation and its effectiveness on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. McCarville et al. (1998) explored students' reactions to various sponsorship activations in an experimental nonprofit sporting event, focusing on perceptions of the sponsor or its product and purchase intentions. They used a five-group study with different cumulative exposures to activations: (1) control, (2) cause sponsorship exposure (logo), (3) cause sponsorship plus detailed sponsor information (sponsor's telephone numbers and slogans), (4) cause sponsorship, sponsor information, plus coupons, and (5) cause sponsorship, sponsor information, coupons, plus product sample (pizza). The results revealed that students receiving product samples responded most positively in perceptions of the sponsor's

product and purchase intentions, whereas sponsorship messages presented only by logos, the sponsor's telephone numbers, slogans, or coupons failed to alter perceptions of the sponsor or its product.

Sneath et al. (2005) also considered another type of activation and its effectiveness. They collected data from the attendees at a large charity sporting event and assessed both attitudes toward a title sponsor (an automobile manufacturer) and purchase intentions toward its product between those who had visited its exhibits (tents) and those who had not. The exhibits provided attendees with more interaction with the sponsor's product and brand representatives. Those who attended the exhibits had the opportunity to interact with cars and trucks (the sponsor's product), speak with the manufacturer representative, and win a drawing for a new vehicle, whereas those who did not attend might merely be exposed to the sponsor's name and logo displayed on banners, signage, T-shirts, and large-screen televisions, or the sponsor's name sounded through PA announcements. Results revealed significant differences between two groups in both brand attitude and purchase intentions. Those who attended the exhibits had more favorable attitudes toward the sponsor and higher purchase intentions toward the sponsor's product than those who did not attend. The researchers ascribed greater sponsorship outcomes to higher interaction with attendees provided by sponsorship activation.

Both McCarville et al.'s (1998) and Sneath et al.'s (2005) studies suggest that the level of interaction provided by sponsorship activation might be a key factor in its

effectiveness concerning consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Coppetti et al. (2009) created a study to test that notion specifically by investigating the relationship between the level of audience participation in activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in the sponsorship of the Street Parade, one of Europe's largest music festivals. Activation was categorized into three conditions based on audience participation, and the conditions were designed to be additive. In the no-participation condition, event visitors were merely exposed to on-site signage. In the medium-participation condition, activations included on-site signage, a sweepstakes, and a hospitality booth. In the high-participation condition, on top of everything offered in the medium-participation condition, event guests could experience an exclusive dance party and a "laboratory" offering the opportunity to create customized products. The results revealed significant differences in brand attitude and image based on the level of audience participation in sponsorship activation (Coppetti et al., 2009). The greater level of audience participation resulted in more favorable brand attitudes and greater image transfer. The results support that the level of interaction provided in activations is a key factor to enhance its effectiveness in positively impacting consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

To conclude, in order to enhance consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, corporate sponsors should actively leverage sponsorship with activational activities. According to the marketing literature, in order to maximize the effectiveness of sport sponsorship, sponsors should engage in diverse activational activities such as on-site product/service sales, advertising, and promotion on top of signage (Cuneen & Hannan,

1993; Jalleh et al., 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pitts; 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993). In addition, several studies suggest that the level of interaction provided in activations is a key factor to enhance its effectiveness in positively impacting consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Coppetti et al., 2009; McCarville et al., 1998; Sneath et al., 2005). Therefore, designing and including sponsorship activation featuring more interaction with audiences—such as in-game promotions and product sampling—is important to improving consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Summary

“Knowing the return on investment (ROI) of sponsorships is more important than ever” (Maestas, 2009, p. 99). In this tough economic climate, all marketing budgets are under scrutiny, including sponsorship investment. ROI plays a critical role in sponsorship decision making or sponsorship renewal. CEOs and finance directors are under growing pressure to scrutinize the potential ROI of sponsorship prior to making decisions to venture into sponsorship investment (Chudy, 2008; Green, 2008; Maestas, 2009). Therefore, when soliciting sponsorship or negotiating sponsorship renewal, it is critically necessary for sponsorship rights owners to provide blueprints that assist prospective or current sponsors in meeting or exceeding expected ROI. Sponsorship activation is an essential element in that blueprint. Properly executed activation maximizes ROI (Cornwell, Roy, & Steinard, 2001; Mayo & Bishop, 2010; Maestas, 2009; O’Keefe,

Titlebaum, & Hill, 2009; Santomier, 2008), which leads to higher sponsorship renewal rates. It truly creates a win-win situation for both parties.

Although numerous marketing practitioners and scholars have consistently advocated the critical role of sponsorship activation in maximizing ROI, there remains a scarcity of sponsorship activation studies. When entering into sport sponsorship, corporate sponsors may set up different sponsorship objectives such as increasing awareness, enhancing brand attitude, increasing sales, or a combination thereof. Little is known concerning strategic activation selection for achieving different sponsorship objectives. Therefore, the impacts of various activational activities on sponsorship objectives is an important area of study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the demographics and lifestyles characteristics of attendants of games played by an Independent Professional Baseball (IPB) team and to determine the effects of on-site activations on three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. In this study, on-site activations consisted of signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes included a cognitive outcome (sponsorship awareness), an affective outcome (brand preference), and a behavioral outcome (purchase intentions). This study also compared the impact of various on-site activations in explaining the variance of three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. This chapter is organized into four sections: (a) participants and setting, (b) data collection, (c) instrumentation, (d) validity and reliability, and (e) data analysis.

Participants and Setting

Participants

The participants in this study were spectators of a sport event hosted by an IPB team. The selected spectators were males and females 18 years or older. During the event, the spectators might be exposed to various on-site sponsorship activations such as

signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements.

Setting

The selected IPB franchise is a new team located in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington metropolitan area, widely considered the economic and cultural center of North Texas. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 estimate, the area, with a population of over 6 million, is the largest metropolitan area in Texas and the fourth largest in the United States. Also, the region boasts the sixth-highest gross metropolitan product (GMP) in the United States, only surpassed by New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, and Washington (The United States Conference of Mayors, 2010). The DFW metro area is a prosperous and ideal market for professional sports to root in, including the selected IPB team.

The team, nevertheless, is not the only sport team enjoying this marketing niche. There are five major league franchises, seven other professional teams, and four Division I universities in the area. Clearly, the IPB team encounters strong competitors amid the pool of sponsorship resources. This new team is still developing its sponsorship program and struggles to survive in this competitive market. Therefore, the team's on-site activations and their effects on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes warrant careful examination.

Data Collection

Required data in this study consists of four major sections—(1) demographics and lifestyles, (2) implementation of on-site activations, (3) participation in on-site activations, and (4) three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The on-site activations include signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements, while the consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes include brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions.

Data for the implementation of on-site activations was collected from observations. The results of the observations indicate the uses and numbers of on-site activations at a given event.

Data about the demographics and lifestyles of the participants, their participation in on-site activations, and the three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions) were collected from questionnaires delivered to event spectators. The data was collected by several trained data collectors and the principal researcher. The data collectors were graduate students in either sport management or a marketing-related program at a university in the Southwest. Prior to collecting the data, the questionnaires were provided and explained to each data collector. In addition, the data collectors were trained on how to approach and screen potential participants. When approaching potential participants, the data collectors would introduce themselves as “graduate students at a university in the southern United States” and then inform spectators of the purpose of the study and its benefit to minor league

baseball. They would also be informed that participation is voluntary. To screen potential participants, the data collectors would ask every third potential spectator over the age of 18 to complete a questionnaire.

In general, the number and arrangement of on-site activations vary for different events. In other words, a spectator at a particular event will experience specific levels of sponsorship stimulus exposure and frequency of event participation. It has been well demonstrated that the frequency of event participation (Bennett, 1999; Bennett et al., 2002; Grohs et al., 2004; Lacey, Sneath, Finney, & Close, 2007) and the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure (e.g., signage, advertising, in-game promotion) (Bornstein, 1989; Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Pope & Voges, 1997) can impact spectators' brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions. This study examined specifically the associations between on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Consequently, in order to set aside the impact of frequency of event participation and level of sponsorship stimulus exposure, the data was collected at three games played on three consecutive days near the end of the 2011 regular season.

Data collections were conducted at the three games during the month of August 2011. Due to a limited number of data collectors and the expected heavy traffic of departing spectators, data collections started soon after the end of the sixth inning. Data collectors were assigned to concession areas and each exit of the facility to disseminate the questionnaires. Data collectors would inform potential participants that a free team's

ticket would be given after finishing the questionnaire. Potential participants would be given a questionnaire packet including a questionnaire, a clipboard, and a pen.

Sample Size

This study adopted multiple regression analyses to examine the data. When determining the minimum sample size for conducting multiple regression analyses, power, effect size, and alpha level were considered. In this study, the value of medium effect size was estimated. The statistical power level and alpha level were set as .80 and .05, respectively. There were five predictors, including signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements. To explore the importance of individual predictors using multiple regression analyses, a minimum of 109 participants was required (Green, 1999).

Instrumentation

Participation in on-site activations is required for examining participant associations with the three types of consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The data was collected from the questionnaires delivered to the spectators. The questionnaire consists of five sections: (1) demographics and lifestyle information, (2) participation in on-site activations, (3) brand awareness, (4) brand preference, and (5) purchase intentions. The instrument can be viewed in Appendix A, page 98.

Demographics and Lifestyles

To obtain the demographic profile of the spectators, the questionnaire asks participants' gender, age, ethnicity, education level, marital status, household income,

and number of children living in the household. The lifestyle questions include ticket type for entering the game, channel for obtaining game information, and baseball-related activity.

Participation in On-Site Activations

Five questions are designed to measure participation in on-site activations. The questions address whether participants “saw sponsors’ signs,” “heard sponsors’ PA announcements,” “viewed sponsors’ advertising,” “interacted with sponsors’ in-game promotions,” or “visited sponsors’ on-site product sampling/display/sales.”

Given that sponsorship effectiveness can vary based on the frequency of event participation (Bennett, 1999; Bennett et al., 2002; Grohs et al., 2004; Lacey et al., 2007) and the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure (e.g., signage, advertising, in-game promotion) (Bornstein, 1989; Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Pope & Voges, 1997), this study also explored those factors. Questions designed to obtain data on the frequency of event participation include the query, “how many games have you attended in this season (including this game).” Questions designed to collect data on the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure include phrases such as, “number of signs viewed,” “number of PA announcements heard,” “number of ads viewed,” “number of in-game promotions interacted with,” and “number of experiences with on-site product sampling/displays/sales visits.”

In addition, this study explored which on-site sponsorship activation was perceived by subjects as the most memorable from the game. The questions designed to

elicit that information are “which sponsorship activity do you remember most from tonight’s game?” and “other than the activity you selected above, what do you remember most from tonight’s game?”

Brand Awareness

Recall and recognition measures are well-established in scholarly literature as methods for assessing brand awareness (Barros et al., 2007; Bennett et al., 2002; Boshoff & Gerber, 2008; Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Grohs et al., 2004; Harshaw & Turner, 1999; Ishikawa et al., 1996; Kutintara, 2009; Lee & Bang, 2005; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Meir et al., 1997; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Nicholls & Roslow, 1999; Pitts, 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993, 2002; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989; Tripodi & Hirons, 2009; Turley & Shannon, 2000; Van Heerden et al., 2004). In this study, recognition measures were utilized to measure brand awareness. The participants were asked to identify event sponsors, cued by an event sponsorship prompt. The question on this topic is, “below is a list of companies. Without looking around, which companies were sponsors of tonight’s game?”

Brand Preference

Davies et al.’s (2006) three-item scale was modified and utilized to measure brand preference. The items in Davies et al.’s (2006) scale show a strong internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .95$). Prior to asking questions measuring brand preference, the participants were informed, “a variety of product/service categories (e.g., bank, food, drink, restaurant, car, insurance) are covered by the team’s sponsors. Please answer the

following questions.” The modified items include “overall, I like the team’s sponsors better than other similar companies in the same product category,” “I would consider or use the products and services from a team’s sponsors more than other similar products and services,” and “overall, the team’s sponsors are my preferred brand compared to other similar brands.” These items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Purchase Intentions

Purchase intentions were measured by a modified Kutintara’s (2009) four-item scale. The items in the Kutintara’s (2009) scale show strong internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .851$). The participants would be asked to rate statements such as, “I will consider purchasing products/services from the sponsors of the team,” “I would try a sponsor’s new product/service because I saw it at the game,” “I intend to purchase the products/services from companies that sponsor the team,” and “by purchasing the products/services from companies that sponsor the team, I am helping the team win.” The four items were structured by a five-point Likert scale format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Validity and Reliability

Content validity refers to “the degree to which an instrument logically appears to measure an intended variable, as determined by expert judgment” (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001, p. 516). The content validity of the questionnaire in this study was evaluated using a panel of experts (one sport management professor, one statistics professor, one

marketing professor, one coaching professor, and two IPB marketing administrators) who were asked to comment on the relevance, representativeness, and clarity of items and provide suggestions for improving the questionnaire. Suggestions from the panel would be used in questionnaire modification.

Reliability refers to consistency, or “the degree to which scores obtained with an instrument are consistent” (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001, p. 97). When using a multi-item measurement scale, a measurement of internal consistency for reliability is required. Internal consistency is the “internal reliability of a measurement instrument; the extent to which each test question has the same value for the attribute the test measures” (McIntire & Miller, 2000, p. 572). Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is one of the most commonly-used and accepted procedures for determining the internal consistency of a measure. In this study, it was utilized to measure the reliability of questions related to spectators’ brand preference and purchase intentions. According to Nunnally (1978), an alpha coefficient equal to or above 0.70 is generally considered an acceptable measurement. Therefore, items whose factors have an alpha coefficient lower than .70 will be eliminated.

Data Analysis

Raw data was entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 18.0. Prior to analyzing the associations between on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, descriptive characteristics and frequencies of all questions were computed in order to check for plausible errors and data entry errors. Data from respondents below age 18 and those who left many items unanswered were

deleted from the data set. In order to examine the association between on-site activations and brand awareness, the percentage of correct identification from a total of the event sponsors was calculated.

An exploratory factor analysis (principal component analysis) was conducted to justify the validity of the scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed to determine internal consistency of scores for two factors—brand preference and purchase intentions. According to Nunnally (1978), the cutoff value should be .70 for an exploratory study or instrument development. Therefore, in this study items with factors having a value of Cronbach's alpha lower than .70 were eliminated.

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were utilized to determine the associations between five on-site sponsorship activations (signage, in-game promotional activities, advertising, on-site product sampling/display/sales, and PA announcements) and three consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions). The independent variables were participation in five separate on-site activations. Each independent variable had two levels, participation in an on-site activation and non-participation in that on-site activation. The three dependent variables were brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were run three times with each dependent variable separately.

Overall, two kinds of statistical analyses, exploratory factor analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis, were used in this study. An exploratory factor analysis was utilized to justify the validity of the two scales—brand preference and purchase. Stepwise

multiple regression analysis was applied to examine the relationships between the five on-site sponsorship activations and the three consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to convey the statistical analyses relative to the study's research questions and the results of research findings. This chapter is organized into five sections: (1) demographics and lifestyles, (2) participation in on-site sponsorship activations, (3) consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, and (4) relationships between on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The first section responds to Research Question 1:

Q1. What are the demographics and lifestyles of spectators?

The demographic information includes participant gender, age, ethnicity, education level, marital status, household income, and number of children living in the household, while the results of the lifestyle questions reveal the participants' game attendance during the current season, ticket type for entering the game, channel for obtaining game information, and baseball-related activity. The exploration of participation in on-site sponsorship activations embraces event attendance, the first- and second-most memorable activations perceived by subjects, participation in on-site activations, and the number of activations. Consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes encompass the results of brand awareness, brand preference, and purchase intentions, as well as the reliability of brand preference

and purchase intentions. The results of the relationships between on-site activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes form the basis of Research Questions 2 and 3:

Q2. What are the relationships between on-site activations and spectators' (1) brand awareness, (2) brand preference, and (3) purchase intentions?

Q3. Which on-site activation variable has the most impact in explaining variances among spectators' (1) brand awareness, (2) brand preference, and (3) purchase intentions?

Demographics and Lifestyles

Data for this study was collected at three consecutive Independent Professional Baseball games in August 2011, which took place at the end of the 2011 regular season. Table 1 reports the demographic data of all participants on page 54. A total of 194 participants completed a self-administrated questionnaire. Of those respondents, 56.7% ($n = 110$) were male and 43.3% ($n = 84$) were female. The overall age of the respondents ranged from 18 to 83 years old. The majority of the respondents were either between the ages of 35 and 49 (39.1% or $n = 76$) or between the ages of 55 and 64 (24.3% or $n = 47$). Approximately 77% were white/Caucasian, 66.5% of the respondents had some college or were college graduates, 52.1% had at least one child in the household, and 70.6% were married. In terms of household incomes, the majority earned \$15,000-\$50,000 (29.6% or $n = 53$) or over \$100,000 (27.9% or $n = 50$).

With regard to lifestyles, the majority of the respondents entered the game either by using game tickets (49.7%) or complimentary tickets (27.5%). Season ticket holders

only accounted for 6.3%. The Internet (27.2%) and friends (24.4%) were two primary ways to obtain game information. It is worth noting that approximately 9% of respondents used social media to obtain game information. Of the respondents, 75.3% watched baseball on television, 30.4% read baseball news online, 28.4% read baseball-related news in print, and 21.6% followed baseball on a social network.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

Demographic	Percentage	Frequency
Gender		
Male	56.7	110
Female	43.3	84
Age		
18-24	11.9	23
25-34	17.0	33
35-49	39.1	76
50-64	24.3	47
65+	7.7	15
Education		
High school graduate	17.5	34
Some college	34.0	66
College graduate	32.5	63
Graduate school	12.9	25
Other	3.1	6

(continued)

Table 1 cont'd

Demographic	Percentage	Frequency
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	77.8	151
Black/African American	6.7	13
Asian	1.5	3
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.5	1
Hispanic or Latino origin	10.8	21
Prefer not to answer	1.5	3
Other	1.0	2
Marital		
Single	24.2	47
Married	70.6	137
Divorced	3.1	6
Partner	2.1	4
Income		
Below \$15,000	3.9	7
\$15,000-\$50,000	29.6	53
\$50,001-\$74,999	17.9	32
\$75,000-\$100,000	20.7	37
Over \$100,000	27.9	50
Household		
None	47.9	90
1	20.2	38
2	13.3	25
3	9.6	18
4	5.9	11
5	0.5	1
6	1.1	2
More than 6	1.6	3

Participation in On-Site Sponsorship Activations

There are five on-site sponsorship activations covered in this study: signage, public address (PA) announcements, advertising, in-game promotions, and on-site product display/sampling/sales. After the observations of the games, the study established details of the five sponsorship activations. Signage locations included the video board, the press box, the outfield billboard, the entrance, the all-you-can-eat zone, the bar zone, the bullpen, and the fan information table. PA announcements communicated the introduction of corporate sponsors or their recent marketing activity, brief announcements tied to the team (e.g., official team doctor and official team energy company), and brief announcements associated with team performance (e.g., strikeout sponsor, pitcher change sponsor, and home run sponsor). They were transmitted before, during, and after the game. Related advertising could be found on players' and staffs' uniforms, a pocket schedule, a magnet schedule, the event program, beer sales stands, cup holders behind all the seats in the ballpark, the walls and doors in the restrooms, and ticket stubs. In-game promotion included a sponsors' mascot running race and frisbee toss, as well as a team shirt giveaway. Product display/sampling/sales included beer sales, beverage sales, and a car display.

Table 2 below reports event attendance during the 2011 regular season. The results revealed that the majority of the respondents attended one to two home games (56.0% or $n = 103$) of the forty home games in the 2011 regular season.

Table 2

Sample Lifestyles

Lifestyle	Percentage	Frequency
Game attendance		
1-2	56.0	103
3-10	30.4	56
11-20	6.5	12
21-40	7.1	13
Ticket		
Individual ticket	49.7	94
Mini-plan	1.6	3
Half season package	2.1	4
Season ticket holder	6.3	12
Complimentary ticket	27.5	52
Gift	10.1	19
Won tickets in promotion	2.1	4
Game information		
TV	2.2	4
Internet	27.2	49
Radio	2.2	4
Social network	8.9	16
Friend	24.4	44
Event program	9.4	17
Road sign	0.6	1
Other	25.0	45

(Continued)

Table 2 cont'd

Lifestyle	Percentage	Frequency
Baseball-related activity		
Recreational baseball	16.0	31
Competitive baseball	10.8	21
Fantasy baseball	5.2	10
Baseball videogames	12.4	24
Baseball news online	30.4	59
Baseball card	8.8	17
Baseball on TV	75.3	146
Baseball-related news in print	28.4	55
Baseball info on a social network	21.6	42

Tables 3 and 4 report the most memorable on-site sponsorship activation and the second-most memorable on-site sponsorship activation, respectively. The sponsorship activity remembered most was in-game promotions (36.0%), followed by signage (22.8%), PA announcements (18.0%), advertising (14.8%), and product display/sampling/sales (8.5%). The second-most memorable sponsorship activity was in-game promotions (39.2%), followed by signage (21.7%), PA announcements (17.5%), product display/sampling/sales (17.5%), and advertising (13.2%). According to Tables 3 and 4, in-game promotion and signage were the most and second-most memorable sponsorship activations in the ballpark.

Table 3

Most Memorable On-Site Sponsorship Activation

Sponsorship activation	Percentage	Frequency
Signage	22.8	43
PA announcement	18.0	34
Advertising	14.8	28
In-game promotion	36.0	68
Product display/sampling/sales	8.5	16

Table 4

Second Most Memorable On-site Sponsorship Activation

Sponsorship activation	Percentage	Frequency
Signage	21.7	41
PA announcement	17.5	33
Advertising	13.2	25
In-game promotion	30.2	57
Product display/sampling/sales	17.5	33

Tables 5 and 6 report participation in sponsorship activation and the rate of sponsorship activation participation, respectively. According to Table 5, 82.0% of the respondents saw sponsors' signs, 45.9% heard sponsors' PA announcements, 43.3% viewed sponsors' advertising, 28.4% visited sponsors' on-site product sampling/display/sales, and 19.1% interacted with sponsors' in-game promotions.

Table 5

Participation in On-Site Sponsorship Activation

Sponsorship activation	Percentage	Frequency
Signage		
Participation	82.0	159
Non-participation	18.0	35
PA Announcement		
Participation	45.9	89
Non-participation	54.1	105
Advertising		
Participation	43.3	84
Non-participation	56.7	110
In-game Promotion		
Participation	19.1	37
Non-participation	80.9	157
Product display/sampling/sales		
Participation	28.4	55
Non-participation	71.6	139

According to Table 6, 39% of the respondents recognized from 1 to 10 sponsors' signs, and 26.7% recognized 11 to 20 sponsors' signs. Approximately 40% of the surveyed heard 1 to 10 sponsors' PA announcements, 29.8% viewed 1 to 10 sponsors' advertisements, 26.5% visited at least one sponsors' on-site product sampling/display/sales, and 17% interacted with at least one sponsors' in-game promotion. More than 50% of the respondents, however, did not remember any sponsors' information from PA announcements, advertising, in-game promotions, or on-site

product sampling/display/sales. In-game promotions and on-site product sampling/display/sales resulted especially in the lowest interaction with event spectators. 80.9% of the respondents interacted with “no” sponsors’ in-game promotions, and 71.6% reported visiting “no” sponsors’ on-site product sampling/display/sales.

Table 6

Rate of On-Site Sponsorship Activation Participation

Sponsorship activation	Percentage	Frequency
Signage		
0	20.3	35
1-10	39.0	67
11-20	26.7	46
21-30	8.2	14
31-40	0.6	1
41-50	5.2	9
PA announcement		
0	59.1	104
1-10	39.8	70
11-20	1.1	2
Advertising		
0	60.8	110
1-10	29.8	54
11-20	5.8	11
21-30	1.2	2
31-40	1.2	2
41-50	1.2	2

(continued)

Table 6 cont'd

Sponsorship activation	Percentage	Frequency
In-game promotion		
0	83.0	156
1	7.4	14
2	5.3	10
3	1.6	3
4	2.7	5
Product sampling/display/sales		
0	73.5	139
1	13.2	25
2	8.5	16
3	1.6	3
4	1.6	3
5	0.0	0
6	1.6	3

Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes

Brand Awareness

Levels of brand awareness were measured by brand recognition, in which the respondents were asked to correctly identify team's corporate sponsors when given the brand name as a prompt. A breakdown of the percentage and frequency of brand awareness for all individual sponsors can be viewed in Table 7.

Table 7

Sponsorship Awareness

Corporate sponsor	Sponsor		Not a Sponsor		Not Sure	
	%	f	%	f	%	f
QuikTrip	100.0	194	0.0	0	0.0	0
Pepsi	82.5	160	4.6	9	12.9	25
Pizzaiolo's Pizza & Pasta	76.8	149	7.2	14	16.0	31
Whataburger	75.3	146	6.7	13	18.0	35
City of Grand Prairie	68.0	132	4.6	9	27.3	53
Dos Equis	64.4	125	8.2	16	27.3	53
Grand Prairie Ford	59.8	116	7.7	15	32.5	63
Hawk Electronics	56.7	110	11.3	22	32.0	62
Parkland Community Health Plan	53.1	103	13.4	26	33.5	65
Miller Light/High Life	53.1	103	15.5	30	31.4	61
Graff Chevrolet	51.0	99	11.9	23	37.1	72
Brilliant Energy	50.5	98	13.9	27	35.6	69
Coors Light	50.0	97	16.5	32	33.5	65
Hong Kong Market	49.0	95	17.5	34	33.5	65
UT Southwestern Medical Center	46.9	91	12.9	25	40.2	78
Texas Farm Bureau insurance	42.8	83	17.0	33	40.2	78
Landings of Carrier Parkway	38.7	75	14.9	29	46.4	90
North Lake/Mountain View College	38.7	75	17.5	34	43.8	85
Cerveza Tecate	38.1	74	19.6	38	42.3	82
Pizza Hut	38.1	74	20.1	39	41.8	81
Dick's Sporting Goods	36.6	71	17.5	34	45.9	89
Aaron Rents	36.1	70	14.4	28	49.5	96
The Dental Place	35.6	69	19.1	37	45.4	88
ESPN Dallas/Fort Worth (103.3 FM)	35.1	68	14.9	29	50.0	97
CBS 11	35.1	68	20.1	39	44.8	87
Costumes by Dusty	34.5	67	19.6	38	45.9	89
Smirnoff Ice	34.5	67	22.2	43	43.3	84
Texas Roadhouse	33.5	65	19.1	37	47.4	92
Kelley Athletic Co.	33.5	65	21.6	42	44.8	87
Fast Armadillo	32.0	62	18.0	35	50.0	97
Outlaw BBQ	32.0	62	18.6	36	49.5	96

(continued)

Table 7 cont'd

Corporate sponsor	Sponsor		Not a Sponsor		Not Sure	
	%	f	%	f	%	f
GPPA	28.9	56	12.9	25	58.2	113
TMG	27.3	53	17.5	34	55.2	107
JMH Printing	26.8	52	17.5	34	55.7	108
GSW	26.3	51	17.5	34	56.2	109
Elegante Hotel	25.8	50	20.1	39	54.1	105
Amtrak	25.3	49	23.2	45	51.5	100
Wingstop	23.7	46	26.3	51	50.0	97
Image Tek	21.6	42	19.1	37	59.3	115
Nina's Cafe	21.6	42	21.6	42	56.7	110
Resource One	21.6	42	21.6	42	56.7	110
All American Pest Management	21.1	41	22.7	44	56.2	109
Patio Scapes	20.1	39	19.6	38	60.3	117
Sam's Club	19.6	38	24.2	47	56.2	109
Andrews Distributing	16.5	32	22.7	44	60.8	118
Liberty Mutual Insurance	16.5	32	23.2	45	60.3	117
Dehay & Elliston	14.4	28	22.2	43	63.4	123
Centennial Court	9.8	19	25.8	50	64.4	125
Golden Corral	5.7	11	35.6	69	58.8	114

The results of sponsorship awareness shown in Table 7 indicated that the official sponsors of an IPB team that conducted on-site product sales or in-game promotions—including QuikTrip, Pepsi, Pizzaiolo's Pizza & Pasta, and Whataburger—had higher brand recognition rates. QuikTrip ranked the highest on recognition percentage for overall participants. Surprisingly, 100% of the participants were able to recognize QuikTrip. The company has a concession store selling its products in a highly exposed spot—the entrance. There is only one entrance in the ballpark; therefore, the spectators entering the ballpark have a high exposure to the company. In addition, the company

utilized an in-game promotion named “QuikTrip Roller Grill Races” in all the 2011 season home games. In the promotion, three QuikTrip food mascots represent three different seat sections in a running race. The winning section is given coupons for a free QuikTrip item. In addition, the company has plentiful signage and advertising around the ballpark. The signage of the company could be seen in some premium spots such as the video board, the entrance, and the press box behind home plate. Their advertisements were put on players’ and staffs’ uniforms, pocket schedules, magnet schedules, event programs, and special event flyers.

Pepsi (82.5%) and Pizzaiolo’s Pizza & Pasta (76.8%) boasted the second- and third-highest recognition percentage, respectively. Both have on-site product sales in the ballpark. Pepsi’s products are available in four of the five concession stores. Pizzaiolo’s Pizza & Pasta has one concession store in the ballpark; in addition, the company also implemented a “\$1 hot dog” promotion in two of the three games played during data collection.

Unlike the three sponsors above, Whataburger’s product is not available at the ballpark. Nevertheless, the company implements an in-game promotion, “Whataburger: 60 Seconds of Mayhem,” in every home game. In the promotion, the song *Cheeseburger in Paradise* is played, the Whataburger logo is displayed on the video board for 60 seconds, frisbees are tossed, and Whataburger coupons are delivered.

Brand Preferences

Approximately 47% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "overall, I like the team's sponsors better than other similar companies in the same product category." Approximately 54% of those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that, "I would consider or use the products and services of a team's sponsors more than other similar products and services." Approximately 45% of those agreed or strongly agreed that, "overall, the team's sponsors are my preferred brands compared to other similar brands."

Purchase Intentions

Approximately 63% of those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I will consider purchasing products/services from the sponsors of the team." Approximately 47% agreed or strongly agreed that, "I will try a sponsor's new product/service because I saw it at the game." About 45% agreed or strongly agreed that, "I intend to purchase the products/services from companies that sponsor the team." 40.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "by purchasing the products/services from companies that sponsor the team, I am helping the team win."

Reliability of Brand Preference and Purchase Intentions

Cronbach's alpha scores were calculated to ascertain the internal consistency reliability of the scales. The results can be seen in Table 8. The alpha scores for each construct exceeded the minimum recommended level of .70 proposed by Nunnally (1978): brand preference, .82; purchase intention, .77.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, Factor Loadings (β), and Cronbach's alpha for Consumer-Focused Sponsorship Outcomes

Subscale	M	SD	β	α
Brand preference				.819
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, I like the team's sponsors better than other similar companies in the same product category 	3.44	.970	.792	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would consider or use the products and services of a team's sponsors more than other similar products and services 	3.53	.928	.720	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the team's sponsors are my preferred brands compared to other similar brands 	3.37	.903	.740	
Purchase intentions				.765
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I will consider purchasing products/services from the sponsors of the team 	3.69	.903	.686	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I will try a sponsor's new product/service because I saw it at the game 	3.34	.920	.681	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I intend to purchase the products/services from companies that sponsor the team 	3.51	.999	.680	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By purchasing the products/services from companies that sponsor the team, I am helping the team win 	3.04	1.238	.797	

Relationships between On-Site Activations and Consumer-Focused

Sponsorship Outcomes

In order to test Research Questions 2 and 3, three regression analyses were used.

In the first analysis, percentage of sponsorship awareness was used as the dependent variable, and five on-site sponsorship activations (signage, PA announcements, advertising, in-game promotion, and product display/sampling/sales) were included as the independent variables. In the second and third regression analyses, brand preference and purchase intentions were used as the dependent variables, respectively, and the five on-site sponsorship activations were the independent variables.

The first regression analysis assessed the degree to which brand awareness would be predicted by the five on-site sponsorship activations. The results shown in Table 9 indicated that the regression analysis produced a significant effect ($F=5.0$, $p<.05$). Product display/sampling/sales ($t=2.3$, $p<.05$) and signage ($t=2.1$, $p<.05$) made significant contributions to brand awareness. The two dimensions together accounted for 5% of the variance in brand awareness. Product display/sampling/sales had the most impact in explaining the variance in brand awareness.

Table 9

Multiple Correlation of Sponsorship Activation with Brand Awareness

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	t	p
Product display/sampling/sales	8.023	3.511	.161	2.285	.023
Signage	8.807	4.115	.151	2.140	.034
(Constant)	28.841	3.832		7.527	.001

Note. $R = .22$, $R^2 = .05$, $\text{Adj-}R^2 = .04$, $\text{SE}=22.03$, $F(2, 191) = 5.04$, $p < .05$

The second regression analysis was performed to test the degree to which brand preference would be predicted by the five on-site sponsorship activations. No significant relationship was found between brand preference and the five on-site sponsorship activations, respectively.

The third regression analysis was run to test the degree to which purchase intentions would be predicted by the five on-site sponsorship activations. Table 10 reports the results. The regression analysis produced a significant effect ($F=4.0$, $p < .05$). Signage ($t=2.0$, $p < .05$) was the only one found to make a significant contribution to purchase intentions; therefore, it has the most impact in explaining the variance in purchase intentions. It alone accounted for 2% of the variance in purchase intentions.

Table 10

Multiple Correlation of Sponsorship Activation with Purchase Intentions

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	t	p
Signage	1.001	.496	.144	2.018	.045
(Constant)	13.381	.264		50.690	.001

Note. $R = .14$, $R^2 = .02$, Adj- $R^2 = .02$, $SE=3.11$, $F(1, 192) = 4.07$, $p < .05$

According to the results of the first and third regression analyses, Research Question 2 was supported. These results demonstrated the relationships between the on-site activations and spectators' brand awareness and purchase intentions. In relation to Research Question 3, product display/sampling/sales had the most impact in explaining the variance in brand awareness, and signage had the most impact in explaining the variance in purchase intentions.

Summary

The main purpose of this chapter is to answer the three research questions. In terms of spectators' demographic profile, the majority of the respondents were male (56.7%), between the ages of 35 and 49 (39.1%), and white/Caucasian (77.8%). They had some college or had graduated college (66.5%), at least one child in the household (52.1%), and household income between \$15,000 and \$50,000. Regarding their lifestyles, the majority of the respondents entered the game by using an individual ticket (49.7%),

used the Internet (27.2%) to obtain game information, and watched baseball on TV (75.3%).

Results from the regression analyses answered Research Questions 2 and 3. The results revealed significant relationships between the on-site activations (signage, PA announcements, advertising, in-game promotion, and product display/sampling/sales) and spectators' brand awareness and purchase intentions. In addition, it was found that product display/sampling/sales has the most impact in explaining the variance in brand awareness, and signage has the most impact in explaining the variance in purchase intentions.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter addresses discussions and implications, limitations, recommendations for future study, and conclusions. Discussions and implications include the results of this study, marketing and managerial implications, and the contributions of the findings. A discussion of limitations reveals key insights for sport marketers and researchers. The recommendations for future study provide directions for further research. Finally, the study is summarized in the conclusion section.

Discussion and Implications

The results of this study found low repeat attendance. The majority of the attendees merely attended one or two home games (56.0%) of the 40 home games in the 2011 regular season. According to previous studies (Bennett, 1999; Bennett et al., 2002; Grohs et al., 2004; Lacey et al., 2007), frequency of event participation can impact spectators' consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Given positive impact of the frequency of event participation, the team should develop strategies to raise event attendance for consolidating or further enhancing sponsors' benefits. The implementation of additional promotions is suggested in achieving such a goal. Numerous studies have documented a positive impact of promotion on attendance (Barilla et al., 2008; Boyd & Krehbiel, 1999; Boyd et al., 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Hixson, 2005; Lanzillo,

2010; McDonald & Rascher, 2000; Pruegger, 2003; Schoenrock & Johnson, 2009; Zhang et al., 2003). Non-price promotions (e.g., giveaways and special events) are especially recommended. Several prior studies have demonstrated that non-price promotions led to greater attendance increase than did price promotions (Barilla et al., 2008; Boyd et al., 2003; Browning & DeBolt, 2007; Lanzillo, 2010; Pruegger, 2003; Schoenrock & Johnson, 2009), and non-price promotions were not found to generate watering-down effects (Hixson, 2005). To maximize sponsors' benefits, the team should also consider tying such promotions to sponsorship. Such a strategic marketing endeavor can expand sponsors' brand exposure and amplify brand interaction with event spectators. For example, giveaways can be constituted by sponsors' products, coupons, or the team's merchandise with sponsors' logos. Moreover, special events can be underwritten by sponsors' naming rights, making possible, for example, a post-event "Walmart concert" or a "Walmart fireworks display".

Bundling sponsors' products or services with event tickets is also suggested for creating a mutually beneficial partnership. According to the results of the spectators' demographics, 52.1% of the event attendants have at least one child. Family emerges as one primary target market for this IPB team. Family ticket packages—including discounts on tickets and sponsors' products (foods and beverages)—seem to be an attractive and effective strategy for this family market. In turn then, increased sales of the sponsors' products driven by this strategy should be helpful in raising sponsors' willingness to renew sponsorship agreements.

Conforming to the findings of past studies (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Jalleh et al., 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Papadimitriou & Apostolopoulou, 2009; Pitts; 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993), the results of this study found positive relationships between on-site sponsorship activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Furthermore, it documented the positive impact of implementing extra sponsorship-related marketing activities on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, which supports the implications of the past studies (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Jalleh et al., 2002; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Papadimitriou & Apostolopoulou, 2009; Pitts; 1998; Sandler & Shani, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Stotlar, 1993). The results of the multiple regression analyses revealed that the effect of signage and on-site product display/sampling/sales together (5.0%) was higher than signage alone (2.7%) in explaining variance in brand awareness. Therefore, it can be suggested that sponsors should arrange multiple sponsorship activities in a given sponsored event in order to attain better consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, especially when the marketing goal is to increase brand awareness.

In addition, this study found that the level of interaction with audiences provided by sponsorship activation is a key factor in its effectiveness concerning consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Past studies have found that on-site activations featuring a high level of interaction with audiences lead to more positive consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in a cause-related sports event and an art event (Coppetti et al., 2009; McCarville et al., 1998; Sneath et al., 2005). The results of this study demonstrate

the same results for professional sports events. The findings indicated that on-site product sampling/display/sales has a higher impact than signage in increasing brand awareness. Therefore, sponsors should ask for the inclusion of sponsorship activation featuring a high level of interaction with audiences in their sponsorship packages in order to obtain greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Sponsorship rights owners should package such activation for higher-tier sponsors rather than lower-tier sponsors to ensure that sponsors that pay more can obtain greater return of investment on sponsorship.

In terms of sponsorship activation with low-level interaction with audiences, this study provides empirical evidence concerning the impact of on-site activations with limited interaction with the audience (signage) on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (brand awareness and purchase intentions) in professional sporting events. The results of multiple regression analyses indicated that signage produces significant contributions in brand awareness and purchase intentions. In the marketing literature, several studies have explored the factors that shape the effectiveness of on-site signage (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pope & Voges, 1997; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989). Numbers of signs and location of signage had the greatest impact on its effectiveness. According to the marketing literature, the optimal number for signage is three to four signs (Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Pope & Voges, 1997), and the premium locations for signage are areas that are "part of the game," highly visible areas, or regions of dense traffic (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Pope & Voges, 1997; Stotlar & Johnson, 1989). For baseball ballparks, "part of the

game” locations can be the scoreboard, the statistics electric board, and the speed of pitch electric board, while highly visible or dense traffic areas could be near event concessions, entrances, and exits.

This study also indicated that sponsors with products that are available at the event obtain higher brand awareness. The results support the implications of past studies (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Shibury & Berriman, 1996). The findings suggest that on-site product display/sampling/sales makes a significant contribution to brand awareness and has the greatest impact on brand awareness among the five sponsorship activations. Such activation also brings an immediate sales opportunity to sponsors’ products or services, although no significant increase of purchase intentions was found due to the appearance of on-site product display/sampling/sales. Therefore, it is strongly suggested to include on-site product display/sampling/sales in sponsorships, especially when sponsorship objectives include increasing brand awareness and product sales.

Despite there being no significant relationship between in-game promotion and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, it should be noted that findings of this study indicated that in-game promotion was perceived as the most memorable on-site sponsorship activation among the five sponsorship activations by 36.0% of the event participants and as the second-most memorable activation by 39.2% of the participants. The two sponsors employing in-game promotions boasted the highest and the fourth-highest awareness rates. QuikTrip was correctly recognized by 100% of the participants, and Whataburger was correctly recognized by 75.3% of the surveyed. The ability of such

activation to be eye catching appears obvious. Currently, there are only two sponsorship-related, in-game promotions in a game, and only one of the seven first-tier sponsors has been given such activation. Apparently, the benefits of those first-tier sponsors are ambushed by lower-level sponsors. Given that in-game promotions may generate greater brand awareness, the team should, following the suggestion of Lagae (2005), design and assign appropriate in-game promotions to each first-tier sponsor, giving such initiatives the highest priority. Lagae (2005) introduces some strategies in forming sponsorship-related, in-game promotion. In-game promotion can work via contest, lottery, or performance, and the winners of the contest or lottery can be rewarded with sponsorship-related giveaways (e.g., clothes and caps) and sponsorship-related monetary incentives (e.g., coupons, cash refunds, and saving cards).

The results of this study, moreover, revealed the weak relationship between on-site sponsorship activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, in which the on-site sponsorship activations accounted for merely 5% of the variance in brand awareness and 2% of the variance in purchase intentions. The marketing literature has suggested strategies to improve the effectiveness of sponsorship activation, including its integration with relationship articulation, goodwill, and team attachment. According to the marketing literature, applying those strategies leads to positive impact on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes (Coppetti et al., 2009; Dees et al., 2008; Irwin, Lachowetz, Cornwell, & Clark, 2003; Lings & Owen, 2007; Tsiotsou & Alexandris, 2009; Watt, 2010; Weeks et al., 2008). In relationship articulation, team sponsors can cooperate with

the team to articulate the relationship between both parties (e.g., the sponsor has regularly supported baseball activity) or to tout a sponsor's non-commercial sponsorship investment to event spectators (Coppetti et al., 2009; Weeks et al., 2008). Examples of goodwill activities that can be integrated into on-site sponsorship activation are the support of youth sports, army appreciation, or any charitable event initiated by the team or its sponsors (Tsiotsou & Alexandris, 2009). Examples of applying team attachment to sponsorship activation are sponsor autograph sessions with team players or any promotion in which team coaches or players can endorse sponsors' products/services (Tsiotsou & Alexandris, 2009).

Observations of on-site sponsorship activations demonstrated the use of five types in the games: signage, PA announcement, advertising, in-game promotion, and product display/sampling/sales. At the IPB level, it has been noted that the team does not have sufficient event staff to execute sponsorship activations for its sponsors. Most of the sponsors at this level, similarly, are short of hands and budget to leverage sponsorship. In such situations, proximity marketing was introduced by Haines (2008a, 2008b) as an economic and effective strategy, and may be used at this level. "Proximity marketing is alternatively called Bluetooth marketing, a term which has arisen from the widespread use of Bluetooth-only mobile connectivity platforms to deliver brand content and location based content to mobile phones" (Haines, 2008a, p. 24). Using Bluetooth mobile connectivity platforms to communicate brand content to event attendants, the IPB teams and its sponsors can save manpower in the operation of in-game promotions, and make

more efficient use of promotion budgets than traditional methods such as signage and advertising.

In conclusion, the findings of this study provide a stronger understanding of the effectiveness of activating sponsorship in a commercial sporting event. The findings uncover positive relationships between on-site sponsorship activations and consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes; moreover, the study illustrates that implementing extra sponsorship-related marketing activities is beneficial in generating greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Therefore, when engaging in sport sponsorship, sponsors should leverage sponsorship with multiple marketing activities. Furthermore, the findings indicate that sponsorship activations with high interaction with audiences (on-site product display/sampling/sales and in-game promotions) are greater than activations with limited interaction (signage, advertising, and PA announcements) in their contribution to sponsorship outcomes. As a result, sponsorship activations featuring high interaction with audiences should be considered as a high priority by both parties when negotiating sponsorship agreements. That does not mean, however, that activation with limited interaction with audience makes no contribution to increased sponsorship outcomes. The findings provide empirical evidence about its positive impact on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Consequently, to maximize return on investment, sponsors should package multiple sponsorship activities with different level of interaction with audiences. Overall, by referring to the results of this study, sponsors can find effective activation methods to reach their sponsorship objectives, and sponsorship rights owners can

package effective activations for sponsors. The findings of this study may assist in generating a greater return on investment for both sponsees and sponsors.

Limitations

The first limitation of this dissertation is in the potential generalizability of the results. The samples of this study are males and females age 18 years or older who attended one or more IPB game in the 2011 regular season. The participants in this study do not fully represent all spectators who attend IPB games. The absence of participants under 18 may affect the ability to generalize the results of this study. Therefore, when applying the results of this study to this or other IPB franchises, marketers should pay attention to this limitation.

The second limitation is related to the content validity of the questionnaire. Because the definitions and examples of the five on-site sponsorship activations were not provided in the questionnaires and the questionnaire were self-administrated surveys, the participants had no opportunity to obtain the meanings of the five on-site activations. That might affect the degree of the questionnaire to measure intended variables— participation in on-site sponsorship activations.

The third limitation regards the impact of frequency of event participation relative to the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure. It has been well demonstrated that the frequency of event participation (Bennett, 1999; Bennett et al., 2002; Grohs et al., 2004; Lacey et al., 2007) and the level of sponsorship stimulus exposure (Bornstein, 1989; Harshaw & Turner, 1993; Pope & Voges, 1997) can impact consumer-focused

sponsorship outcomes. In order to set aside the impact of both factors, this study limited data collection to three games played on three consecutive days in the 2011 regular season. Despite doing so, spectators at the event still experienced different levels of sponsorship stimulus exposure and had different frequency of event participation. The impact of both factors persisted, which may influence the results of this study.

The fourth limitation is the unpredictability of impacts generated by other factors affecting consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes such as relationship articulation, goodwill, team attachment, incongruence, and sport involvement. Because this study could not control the impacts of those factors, their effects may influence the results of this study. Therefore, marketers and researchers should bear in mind that this study considers the impact of sponsorship activation on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes only in real-world situations.

Recommendations for Further Study

First, this study investigated the demographics and lifestyles of event attendees at the IPB level. Exploration of demographics and lifestyle in this milieu is scarce. Notwithstanding, such information remains important for sport marketers in IPB to determine market segments and sponsorship and branding strategies. Future research should continue exploring the demographics and lifestyles of IPB spectators and compare results with this study.

Second, this study examined the effects of on-site activations on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes and compared the impact of various on-site activations to

explain the variance in consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes in the IPB. Future research may apply the principles of this study to different professional baseball scenarios such as minor or major league in order to compare findings.

Third, this study grouped all on-site sponsorship activations into five categories—signage, PA announcements, advertising, in-game promotion, and on-site product display/sampling/sales. For example, on-site product sales and on-site product display were put into the same category (on-site product display/sampling/sales). Therefore, it is difficult to pinpoint the specific activation in each category generating significant effects in particular consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Future research may isolate specific activations and compare their effectiveness with others.

Fourth, proximity marketing is an economic means by which sponsors can communicate brand information to event spectators. This study did not include it. Future research may include it and examine its effectiveness on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Lastly, this study considered the impact of sponsorship activation only on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. In the marketing literature, several factors, including relationship articulation, goodwill, team attachment, incongruence, and sport involvement, have been shown to have impacts on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Future research may examine the interaction effect between on-site sponsorship activation and such factors on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes.

Conclusions

The findings of this study provide a deeper understanding of IPB spectators' demographics and lifestyles. In addition, the findings include strategies to improve low repeat attendance and attract a family market on a basis of enhanced mutual benefit for both a team and its sponsors. For low repeat attendance, the team should include extra non-price promotions (e.g., giveaways and special events) to raise event attendance, and those promotions should be tied to sponsorship in ways that increase sponsors' brand interaction. To capture the family market niche, family ticket packages that bundle sponsors' products or services with event tickets is suggested. A ticket price discount coupled with a discount on food and beverages is attractive to families, and the added sales opportunities driven by family ticket packages should increase sponsors' satisfaction with sponsorship.

According to the findings, leveraging sponsorship with extra sponsorship-related marketing activities generates greater consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. Signage and on-site product display/sampling/sales together make greater contributions to brand awareness than signage alone. Therefore, sponsors should always arrange multiple sponsorship activations in a sponsored event to achieve better consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes, especially when the marketing goal is to increase brand awareness.

In addition, the study's findings demonstrate that the level of interaction with audiences provided by sponsorship activation is a key factor in its effectiveness

concerning consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. The evidence shows that on-site product sampling/display/sales has a higher impact than signage in increasing brand awareness, and sponsors implementing in-game promotion boasted the highest and fourth-highest awareness rates. Therefore, sponsors should always ask for the inclusion in sponsorship packages of sponsorship activation featuring a high level of interaction with audiences such as on-site product sampling/display/sales and in-game promotion. Similarly, sponsorship rights owners should always package such activations primarily for higher-tier sponsors to prevent its benefits being exploited by lower-tier sponsors.

Sponsorship activation with low-level interaction with audiences was also found to have a positive impact on consumer-focused sponsorship outcomes. According to the findings, signage produces significant contributions in brand awareness and purchase intentions. Therefore, such activation should also be considered when negotiating sponsorship agreements. In terms of signage, the optimal number for signs is three to four, and the premium locations for signage are areas that are “part of the game,” highly visible areas, or regions of dense traffic.

Moreover, the findings illustrate that sponsors with products available at the event obtained higher brand awareness. On-site product display/sampling/sales makes the greatest contribution to brand awareness among the five on-site sponsorship activations. In addition, on-site product display/sampling/sales also brings immediate sales opportunities for sponsors’ products or services. Therefore, it is strongly suggested to

include on-site product display/sampling/sales in sponsorship packages, especially when the sponsorship objective is to increase brand awareness and product sales.

This study also provides suggestions to improve the effectiveness of on-site sponsorship activations, including interactions with relationship articulation, goodwill, and team attachment. Relationship articulation elucidates the ties between the team and its sponsors (e.g., the sponsor has regularly supported baseball activity) or highlights a sponsors' non-commercial investments to spectators. Examples of goodwill activities that can be integrated into on-site sponsorship activation are the support of youth sports, army appreciation, or any charitable event initiated by the team or its sponsors. Examples of applying team attachment to sponsorship activation are sponsor autograph sessions with team players or any promotion in which team coaches or players can endorse sponsors' products/services.

As an effective and economical strategy, proximity marketing is suggested to leverage sponsorship at the IPB level. Using the Bluetooth mobile connectivity platform to communicate brand content to event attendants, the IPB teams and their sponsors can save manpower in the operation of in-game promotions, using budgets more effectively than traditional methods such as signage and advertising.

Return on investment (ROI) plays a decisive role in sponsorship decision-making or sponsorship renewal. Properly executed sponsorship activation maximizes ROI. The findings of this study expand understanding of the effectiveness of activating sponsorships in a commercial sporting event and produce guidelines for the strategic

implementation of sponsorship activation. As such, sponsors can find effective activation methods to achieve their objectives by referring to the results of this study. Similarly, sponsorship rights owners can package effective activations for sponsors based on their sponsorship objectives. Taking advantage of the findings may assist in generating a greater ROI for both sponsees and sponsors.

REFERENCES

- A-B of pro sports sponsorships; sector grows 7.6 percent. (2010). *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.sponsorship.com/iegsr/2010/11/15/A-B-Lawsuit-Illustrates-Value-Of-Pro-Sports-Sponso.aspx>
- Ali, C., Cornwell, T. B., Nguyen, D., Coote, L. (2006). Exploring the usefulness of a consumer activity index in the sponsorship-linked marketing context. *International Journal of Sport Marketing & Sponsorship*, 7(2), 115-123.
- Ajen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 27-58.
- Alexandris, K., Tsaousi, E., & James, J. (2007). Predicting sponsorship outcomes from attitudinal constructs: The case of a professional basketball event. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16(3), 130-139.
- Apostolopoulou, A., & Papadimitriou, D. (2004). "Welcome home": Motivations and objectives of the 2004 Grand National Olympic sponsors. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(4), 180-192.
- Arthur, D., Scott, D., Woods, T., & Booker, R. (1998). Sport sponsorship should... a process model for the effective implementation and management of sport sponsorship programmes. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 7(4), 49-60.

- Barilla A., Gruben, K., & Levernier, W. (2008). The effect of promotions on attendance at Major League Baseball games. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 24(3), 1-14.
- Barros, C. P., Barros, C. D., Santos, A., & Chadwick, S. (2007). Sponsorship brand recall at the Euro 2004 Soccer Tournament. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16, 161-170.
- Bennett, R. (1999). Sport sponsorship, spectator recall and false consensus. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(3/4), 291-313.
- Bennett, G., Cunningham, G., & Dees, W. (2006). Measuring the marketing communication activations of a professional tennis tournament. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15, 91-101.
- Bennett, G., Henson, R., & Zhang, J. (2002). Action sports sponsorship recognition. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 11(3), 174-185.
- Bornstein, R. (1989). Exposure and affect: Overview and meta-analysis of research, 1968-1987. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(2), 265-289.
- Boshoff, C., & Gerber, C. (2008). Sponsorship recall and recognition: The case of the 2007 Cricket World Cup. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 39(2), 1-8.
- Boyd, T., & Krehbiel, T. (1999). The effect of promotion timing on Major League Baseball attendance. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 8(4), 23-34.
- Boyd, T., Krehbiel, T., & Farmer, R. T. (2003). Promotion timing in major league baseball and the stacking effects of factors that increase game attractiveness. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(3), 171-183.

- Browning, R., & DeBolt, L. (2007). The effects of promotions on attendance in professional baseball. *Sport Journal*, 10(3), 1-14.
- Chadwick, S., & Thwaites, D. (2005). Managing sport sponsorship programs: Lessons from a critical assessment of English soccer. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45(3), 328-338.
- Choi, J. A. (2010). The impact of ethnic diversity on the ladies professional golf association: A case study of Anheuser-Busch and its sponsorship objectives and strategies. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 19, 51-57.
- Choi, J. A., Stotlar, D. K., & Park, S. R. (2006). Visual ethnography of on-site sport sponsorship activation: LG Action Sports Championship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15(2), 71-79.
- Chudy, B. (2008). Advertising and sponsorship returns: The long-term investment plan. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(1), 36-42.
- Copeland, R., Frisby, W., & McCarville, R. (1996). Understanding the sport sponsorship process from a corporate perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 32-48.
- Coppetti, C., Wentzel, D., Tomczak, T., & Henkel, S. (2009). Improving incongruent sponsorships through articulation of the sponsorship and audience participation. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 15(1), 17-34.
- Cornwell, T. B. (1995). Sponsorship-linked marketing development. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(4), 13-24.
- Cornwell, T. B., & Maignan, I. (1998). An international review of sponsorship research. *Journal of Advertising*, 27(1), 1-21.

- Cornwell, T. B., Roy, D. P., & Steinar II, E. A. (2001). Exploring managers' perceptions of the impact of sponsorship on brand equity. *Journal of Advertisement*, 30(2), 41-51.
- Cornwell, T. B., Weeks, C. S., & Roy, D. P. (2005). Sponsorship-linked marketing: Opening the black box. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(2), 21-42.
- Crompton, J. L. (2004). Conceptualization and alternate operationalizations of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport. *Leisure Studies*, 23(3), 267-281.
- Cuneen, J., & Hannan, M. (1993). Intermediate measures and recognition testing of sponsorship advertising at an LPGA tournament. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(1), 47-56.
- Dallas Mavericks Sponsorship Overview 2010-2011 (2010). Retrieved from http://www.mymavs.net/docs/11_SportsSponsorship.pdf
- Danylchuk, K. E. (2000). Tobacco sponsorship: Spectator perceptions at an LPGA at an LPGA event. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 9, 103-111.
- Dardis, F. (2009). Attenuating the negative effects of perceived incongruence in sponsorship: How message repetition can enhance evaluations of an "incongruent" sponsor. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(1/2), 36-56.
- Davies, F., Veloutsou, C., & Costa, A. (2006). Investigating the influence of a joint sponsorship of rival teams on supporter attitudes and brand preferences. *Journal of Marketing Communication*, 12(1), 31-48.

- Dees, W., Bennett, G., & Villegas, J. (2008). Measuring the effectiveness of sponsorship of an elite intercollegiate football program. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17, 79-89.
- DeGaris, L., West, C., & Dodds, M. (2009). Leveraging and activating NASCAR sponsorships with NASCAR-linked sales promotions. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 3(1), 88-97.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Farrelly, F., & Quester, P. (2005). Examining important relationship quality constructs of the focal sponsorship exchange. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(3), 211-219.
- Fortunato, J. (2009). Using sponsorship as a form of public relations: A case study of Chevrolet and Major League Baseball. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(4), 330-339.
- Gardner, M. P., & Shuman, P. (1988). Sponsorship and small business. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 26(4), 44-52.
- Green, A. (2008). Planning for effective evaluation: Are marketers really doing it? *Journal of Sponsorship*, 1(4), 357-363.
- Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(3), 499-510.
- Grohs, R., Wagner, U., & Vsetecka, S. (2004). Assessing the effectiveness of sport sponsorships: An empirical examination. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 56, 119-138.

- Haines, E. (2008a). Brand activation and ROI using Bluetooth proximity marketing solutions in event sponsorship. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(1), 22-30.
- Haines, E. (2008b). The dos and don'ts of proximity marketing in sponsorship. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(2), 113-119.
- Harshaw, C. E., & Turner, E. T. (1999). Assessing the recognition of perimeter advertising signage by television viewers of NASCAR Winston Cup events. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 8(4), 35-41.
- Hixson, T. K. (2005). Price and non-price promotions in minor league baseball and the watering down effect. *Sport Journal*, 8(4).
- Howard, D. R., & Crompton, J. L. (2004). *Financing sport* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- IEG/Performance research sponsorship decision-makers survey (2010). *IEG Sponsorship Report*.
- In-game promotions. (2011). Retrieved from <http://hurricanes.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=46131>
- International Events Group. (2010). IEG lexicon and glossary. Retrieved from <http://www.sponsorship.com/Resources/IEG-Lexicon-and-Glossary.aspx>
- Irwin, R., Lachowetz, T., Cornwell, T., & Clark, J. (2003). Cause-related sport sponsorship: An assessment of spectator beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(3), 131-139.
- Irwin, R. L., Sutton, W. A., & McCarthy, L. M. (2008). *Sport promotion and sales management* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Ishikawa, S., Stotlar, D. K., & Walker, M. L. (1996). Olympic Games marketing in Japan. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 5(4), 17-25.
- Jalleh, G., Donovan, R., Giles-Corti, B., & Holman, C. (2002). Sponsorship: Impact on brand awareness and brand attitudes. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 8(1), 35-45.
- Jarvis, N. (2002). Sponsorship and gay sport: A case study of the 2000 Gay Softball World Series. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 4(3), 205-230.
- Javalgi, R. G., Traylor, M. B., Gross, A. C., & Lampman, E. (1994). Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 23(4), 47-58.
- Johar, G., Pham, M., & Wakefield, K. (2006). How event sponsors are really identified: A (baseball) field analysis. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46(2), 183-198.
- Jowdy, E., & McDonald, M. (2002). The Futures Golf Tour case study: Sponsorship sales and eduselling. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 11(4), 248-251.
- Kelly, L., & Whiteman, C. (2010). Sports sponsorship as an IMC tool: An Australian sponsor's perspective. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 4(1), 26-37.
- Kutintara, I. (2009). *A comparison study of sponsorship effectiveness between on-site and web-based sponsorship activities*. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Northern Colorado.
- Lacey, R., Sneath, J., Finney, Z., & Close, A. (2007). The Impact of repeat attendance on event sponsorship effects. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 13(4), 243-255.

- Lachowetz, T., & Irwin, R. (2002). FedEx and the St. Jude Classic: An application of a cause-related marketing program (CRMP). *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 11(2), 114-116.
- Lagae, W. (2005). *Sport sponsorship and marketing communications: A European perspective*. Harlow, England: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Lamont, M., & Dowell, R. (2008). A process model of small and medium enterprise sponsorship of regional sport tourism events. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(3), 253-266.
- Lanzillo, J. D. (2010). *The attitudes of Minor League Baseball fans and team administrators toward the use of promotions*. Doctoral Dissertation: Wilmington University.
- Lee, J. H., & Bang, J. S. (2005). An analysis of brand recall of 2002 FIFA Korea/Japan World Cup on official sponsor corporation. *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, 17(1), 30-41.
- Lough, N. L., & Irwin, R. L. (2001). A comparative analysis of sponsorship objectives for U.S. women's sport and traditional sport sponsorship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 10(4), 202-211.
- Lings, I. N., & Owen, K. M. (2007). Buying a sponsor's brand: The role of affective commitment to the sponsored team. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(5-6), 483-496.
- Ludwig, S., & Karabetsos, J. (1999). Objectives and evaluation processes utilized by sponsors of the 1996 Olympic Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 8(1), 11-19.

- Maestas, A. J. (2009). Guide to sponsorship return on investment. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 3(1), 98-102.
- Masterman, G. (2007). *Sponsorship: For a return on investment*. Burlington MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Mayo, D., & Bishop, T. (2010). Fixed rights to activation ratios can harm sponsorship ROI. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 4(1), 9-14.
- Maxwell, H., & Lough, N. (2009). Signage vs. no signage: An analysis of sponsorship recognition in women's college basketball. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 18(4), 188-198.
- Meir, R., Arthur, J., & Massingham, C. (1997). Professional rugby league in Australia: a case study in sponsor awareness. *Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 1(2).
- McCarville, R. E., Flood, C. M., & Froats, T. A. (1998). The effectiveness of selected promotions on spectators' assessments of a nonprofit sporting event sponsor. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 51-62.
- McDonald, M., & Rascher, D. (2000). Does bat day make cents? The effect of promotions on the demand for Major League Baseball. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14(1), 8-27.
- McIntire, S., & Miller, L. (2000). *Foundations for psychological testing*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Meenaghan, T. (1991). The role of sponsorship in the marketing communications mix. *International Journal of Advertising*, 10(1), 35-47.

- Meenaghan, T. (1994). Point of view: Ambush marketing: Immoral or imaginative practice? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 34(5), 77-88.
- Meenaghan, T. (1996). Ambush marketing: A threat to corporate sponsorship. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(1), 103-113.
- Miloch, K. S., & Lambrecht, K. W. (2006). Consumer awareness of sponsorship at grassroots sport events. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15, 147-154.
- Nicholls, J., & Roslow, S. (1999). Brand recall and brand preference at sponsored golf and tennis tournaments. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(3/4), 365-386.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Keefe, R., Titlebaum, P., & Hill, C. (2009). Sponsorship activation: Turning money spent into money earned. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 3(1), 43-53.
- Olson, E., & Thjømøe, H. (2003). The effects of peripheral exposure to information on brand preference. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(1/2), 243-255.
- Papadimitriou, D., & Apostolopoulou, A. (2009). Olympic sponsorship activation and the creation of competitive advantage. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(1/2), 90-117.
- Papadimitriou, D., Apostolopoulou, A., & Dounis, T. (2008). Event sponsorship as a value creating strategy for brands. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 17(4), 212-222.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Schumann, D. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 135-146.

- Pitts, B. (1998). An analysis of sponsorship recall during Gay Games IV. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 7(4), 11-18.
- Pope, N. K., & Voges, K. E. (1997). An exploration of sponsorship awareness by product category and message location in televised sporting events. *Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 1(1).
- Pro sports leagues offset sponsor losses with new inventory, categories. (2010). *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.sponsorship.com/iegsr/2009/12/21/Pro-Sports-Leagues-Offset-Sponsor-Losses-With-New-.aspx>
- Product integration: Not just for technology companies anymore. (2004). *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 23(8), 1-3.
- Pruegger, B. E. (2003). *The effect of game day promotions on consumer behavior in the East Coast Hockey League (ECHL)*. Doctoral Dissertation: The Florida State University.
- Quester, P. G., & Thompson, B. (2001). Advertising and promotion leverage on arts sponsorship effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 4, 33-47.
- Sandage, C. (1983). *Advertising theory and practice*. Homewood, IL: Richard Irwin, Inc.
- Sandler, D., & Shani, D. (1993). Sponsorship and the Olympic Games: The consumer perspective. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(3), 38-43.
- Santomier, J. (2008). New media, branding and global sports sponsorship. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 10(1), 15-28.

- Schoenrock, A., & Johnson, M. (2009). The effects of promotions on attendance at Major League Baseball Games. *Oshkosh Scholar*, 4, 28-36.
- Séguin, B. (2007). 'Sponsorship in the trenches': Case study evidence of its legitimate place in the promotional mix. *Sport Journal*, 10(1).
- Shannon, J. R., & Turley, L. W. (1997). The influence of in-arena promotions on purchase behavior and purchase intentions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 6(4), 53-59.
- Shilbury, D., & Berriman, M. (1996). Sponsorship awareness: A study of St. Kilda Football Club supporters. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 5(1), 27-33.
- Smith, C. (2008). FedExCup sponsorship of new season-long competition delivers for PGA Tour and Tour marketing partners. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(1), 11-21.
- Smolianov, P., & Aiyeku, J. F. (2009). Corporate marketing objectives and evaluation measures for integrated television advertising and sports event sponsorships. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(1/2), 74-89.
- Sneath, J., Finney, R., & Close, A. (2005). An IMC approach to event marketing: The effects of sponsorship and experience on customer attitudes. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45(4), 373-381.
- Sparks, R., & Westgate, M. (2002). Broad-based and targeted sponsorship strategies in Canadian women's ice hockey, *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 4(1), 59-84.

Sponsors send clear signal: We're coming back. (2010). *IEG Sponsorship Report*.

Retrieved from <http://www.sponsorship.com/IEGSR/2010/03/22/Sponsors-Send-Clear-Signal--We-re-Coming-Back.aspx>

Sponsorship spending recedes for first time; better days seen ahead. (2010). *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 28(24), 1-3.

Stotlar, D. (1993). Sponsorship and the Olympic Winter Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(3), 35-43.

Stotlar, D. (2002). Sport sponsorship: Lessons from the Sydney Olympic Games. *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, 14(2), 27-45.

Stotlar, D. K. (2005). *Developing successful sport sponsorship plans* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Stotlar, D. K., & Johnson, D. A. (1989). Assessing the impact and effectiveness of stadium advertising on sport spectators at Division I institutions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 90-102.

The United States Conference of Mayors (2010). U. S. metro economies. Retrieved from <http://www.usmayors.org/metroeconomies/0110/report.pdf>

Thwaites, D., & Carruthers, A. (1998). Practical applications of sponsorship theory: Empirical evidence from English club rugby. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 203-219.

Tomasini, N., Frye, C., & Stotlar, D. (2004). National Collegiate Athletic Association Corporate sponsor objectives: Are there differences between Divisions I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(4), 216-226.

- Tripodi, J. A., & Hirons, M. (2009). Sponsorship leveraging case studies—Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15, 118-136.
- Tripodi, J. A., Hirons, M., Bednall, D., & Sutherland, M. (2003). Cognitive evaluation: Prompts used to measure sponsorship awareness. *International Journal of Market Research*, 45(4), 435-455.
- Tsiotsou, R., & Alexandris, K. (2009). Delineating the outcomes of sponsorship: Sponsor image, word of mouth, and purchase intentions. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 37(4), 358-369.
- Turley, L. W., & Shannon, J. R. (2000). The impact and effectiveness of advertisements in a sports arena. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(2), 323-336.
- Vale, J., Serra, E., Vale, V., & Vieira, J. (2009). The impact of sponsorship on a football team's brand equity. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 2(3), 267-28.
- Van Heerden, C., Kotze, T., & Bruwer, J. (2004). Media exposure and sponsor recall: Cricket World Cup2003. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education & Recreation*, 26(2), 131-140.
- Veltri, F. R., Luehmann-Jaynes, H., & Kuzma, J. (2001). Two methods of sponsor identification: Impact on consumer attitude. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 2, 151-165.
- Wallen, N., & Fraenkel, J. (2001). *Educational research: A guide to the process* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Watt, K. (2008). Challenging conventional approaches to engaging consumers. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 1(3), 258-266.

- Watt, K. (2010). The future of sponsorship integrated with CSR/CSI strategy. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 3(3), 220-227.
- Weeks, C. S., Cornwell, T. B., & Drennan, J. C. (2008). Leveraging sponsorships on the Internet: Activation, congruence, and articulation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 25(7), 637-654.
- Zajonc, R. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 9, 1-27.
- Zajonc, R. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35(2), 151-175.
- Zhang, J. J., Lam, E. T., & Connaughton, D. P. (2003). General market demand variables associated with professional sport consumption. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 5(1), 33-55.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to compare the effectiveness of on-site sponsorship activities. All responses are anonymous, and your personal information will be kept anonymous and confidential. All data will be reported in aggregate form. The return of your completed questionnaire constitutes your informed consent to act as a participant in this research. Thank you for participating in the research.

Brand Awareness

1. Below is a list of companies. Without looking around, which companies were sponsors of tonight's game?

1. QuikTrip	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
2. North Lake/Mountain View College	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
3. Brilliant Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
4. Hawk Electronics	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
5. Parkland Community Health Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
6. UT Southwestern Medical Center	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
7. The Dental Place	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
8. Pepsi	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
9. Andrews Distributing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
10. Coors Light	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
11. Miller Light/High Life	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
12. Dos Equis	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
13. Cerveza Tecate	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
14. Smirnoff Ice	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
15. Whataburger	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
16. Pizzaiolo's Pizza & Pasta	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
17. Nina's Cafe	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
18. Texas Roadhouse	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
19. Wingstop	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
20. Golden Corral	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
21. Pizza Hut	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
22. Outlaw BBQ	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
23. Texas Farm Bureau Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
24. Liberty Mutual Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
25. CBS 11	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
26. ESPN Dallas/Fort Worth (103.3FM)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
27. Amtrak	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
28. All American Pest Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
29. Dick's Sporting Goods	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
30. Image Tek	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure

31	JMH Printing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
32	Costumes by Dusty	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
33	Kelley Athletic Co.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
34	Landings of Carrier Parkway	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
35	Centennial Court	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
36	Fast Armadillo	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
37	Hong Kong Market	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
38	Sam's Club	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
39	TMG	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
40	Dehay & Elliston	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
41	Patio Scapes	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
42	Resource One	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
43	Grand Prairie Ford	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
44	Graff Chevrolet	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
45	Elegante Hotel	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
46	City of Grand Prairie	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
47	GPPA	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
48	GSW	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
49	Aaron Rents	<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not a sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure

Brand Preference

A variety of product/service categories (e.g., bank, food, drink, restaurant, car, insurance) are covered by team's sponsors. Please answer the following questions.

- Overall, I like the team's sponsors better than other similar companies in the same product category.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree
- I would consider or use the products and services of a team's sponsors more than other similar products and services.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree
- Overall, the team's sponsors are my preferred brands compared to other similar brands.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Purchase Intentions

- I will consider purchasing products/services from the sponsors of the team.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree
- I will try a sponsor's new product/service because I saw it at the game.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

7. I intend to purchase the products/services from companies that sponsor the team.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree
8. By purchasing the products/services from companies that sponsor the team, I am helping the team win.
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Participation in On-site Sponsorship Activations

9. Which sponsorship activity do you remember most from tonight's game?
☐ In-game promotion ☐ On-site signage
☐ Advertising ☐ Public Address (PA) announcement
☐ On-site product sampling/display/sales
10. Other than the activity you selected above, what do you remember most from tonight's game?
☐ In-game promotion ☐ On-site signage
☐ Advertising ☐ Public Address (PA) announcement
☐ On-site product sampling/display/sales
11. What sponsorship activities did you participate in at tonight's game? (Check all that apply and fill the numerical question in the end of each question)
☐ Saw sponsors' signs (Number of signs viewed _____)
☐ Heard sponsors' PA announcements (Number of PA announcements heard _____)
☐ Viewed sponsors' advertising (Number of ads viewed _____)
☐ Interacted with sponsors' in-game promotions (Number of the promotion interacted ____)
☐ Visited sponsors' on-site product sampling/display/sales (Number of visits _____)

Demographics

12. What is your gender?
☐ Male ☐ Female
13. What is your age? _____ years old
14. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
☐ High school graduate ☐ College graduate ☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Some college ☐ Graduate school _____

15. How would you classify yourself?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> White/Caucasian | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American | <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino Origin |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to Answer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian and Alaska Native | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ |
16. What is your marital status?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single | <input type="checkbox"/> Married | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced | <input type="checkbox"/> Partner |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
17. What is your household income?
- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below \$15,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$15,000-\$50,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,001 - \$74,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$75,000 - \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$100,000 | |
18. How many children under 18 live in your household?
- ☐ None ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ More than 6
19. How many team games have you attended in this season (including this game)? _____
20. What type of ticket did you purchase for this game?
- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual ticket | <input type="checkbox"/> Mini-Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Half season package |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Season ticket holder | <input type="checkbox"/> Complimentary ticket | <input type="checkbox"/> Gift |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Won tickets in promotion | | |
21. How did you hear about today's game?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> TV | <input type="checkbox"/> Internet | <input type="checkbox"/> Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Network |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friend | <input type="checkbox"/> Event Program | <input type="checkbox"/> Road Sign | Other _____ |
22. What activity do you participate in related to baseball? (You may select more than one)
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Playing recreational baseball | <input type="checkbox"/> Playing competitive baseball |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Playing fantasy baseball | <input type="checkbox"/> Playing baseball videogames |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading baseball news online | <input type="checkbox"/> Collecting baseball card |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Watching baseball on TV | <input type="checkbox"/> Reading baseball-related news in print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Following baseball on a social network (e.g., Facebook and Twitter) | |